

# THE SOUTHERN ASSOCIATION QUARTERLY

---

Volume VI

MAY, 1942

Number 2

---

## Resolutions Adopted by The Commission on Institutions of Higher Education of The Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools

AND APPROVED BY

THE CONFERENCE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF MEMBER COLLEGES AND  
UNIVERSITIES

Atlanta, Georgia, February 6-7, 1942

The first twelve resolutions following, with the preamble to them, represent the final action of the Commission and of the Conference on recommendations submitted by the Executive Council of the Commission. The resolutions, in this final form, were first approved by vote of the Conference; the Commission then took formal action, adopting the resolutions; approval of this action was then reaffirmed by vote of the Conference.

### *Preamble*

The preamble to the resolutions and recommendations adopted by the National Conference of College and University Presidents in Baltimore, January 3-4, opens as follows:

"In the present supreme national crisis we pledge to the President of the United States, Commander-in-Chief of our nation, the total strength of our colleges and universities—our faculties, our students, our administrative organizations, and our physical facilities. The institutions of higher education of the United States are organized for action, and they offer their united power for decisive military victory, and for the ultimate and even more difficult task of establishing a just and lasting peace."

The colleges and universities constituting the membership of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools—approximately 200 in number—accept and endorse this pledge. The members of this Association share with the people of the country deep concern in the present emergency. They are determined to make their full contribution to the national cause, and equally determined to meet the unusual demands of the present. Twenty-five years have passed since higher education faced such an emergency as confronts it today. Before institutions can function with maximum effectiveness, it is vital that they meet, as we are meeting, to establish common

understanding of problems to be faced, and to determine policies to be followed in the solution of such problems.

The colleges of the country have anticipated many of the present problems, and have for some time endeavored to render an enlarged service. Those with facilities needed in the emergency freely made them available long before the declaration of war; many faculty members in many colleges have for some time assumed additional responsibility involving greatly increased expenditures of time and energy.

Since the declaration of war the colleges are moving into greater efforts. Research of vital consequence is being expanded rapidly. Special courses both for students and for the public are being offered, with others to be created as needs arise. Civilian defense training is being speeded materially through the contribution of the colleges in teaching personnel, in classroom and in laboratory space. Of still greater importance, the colleges are trying to do better than they have done before their primary task of producing trained men and women as rapidly as possible.

This is an official meeting of the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. It carries the approval of the President and of the Executive Committee of the Association. It marks the first time in its history that the Commission has met in extraordinary session. All junior colleges, colleges, and universities in the membership have been invited to be present for consideration of the problems facing higher education in this national crisis.

The Executive Council of the Commission believes that the full contribution of the colleges of the Southern Association can be made without sweeping and inclusive changes in the educational system and in the Standards of the Association. The Council hopes that in their zeal to make their contributions, the colleges will not lose sight of the sound principles which must guide all worthwhile efforts. The Council is convinced, further, that the colleges can attain sufficient acceleration in the educational program and can carry on necessary activities more effectively by maintaining the essential requirements that have proved to be fundamental to sound educational procedures.

In light of these principles, the Council offers the following recommendations. In offering these recommendations, the Council has in view the organization of higher education in the interest of the nation's crisis and needs and also the protection of the integrity of the College in the interest of the students themselves in this time of emergency:

- (1) That institutions of higher education give immediate consideration to ways and means for accelerating the progress of students through such extension of the annual period of instruction, and such adjustments of curricula,



as may be consistent with national needs and with educational standards, and as may be possible with available resources;

(2) That desirable acceleration of programs of higher education be accomplished without lowering the established standards of the Southern Association for admission to college. In view of reports that have come to the Commission, particular attention is called to the fact that the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education does not approve the admission to college of students who have not met fully the provisions of Standard One;\*

(3) That a study be made by a joint committee of the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education and the Commission on Secondary Schools of "desirable articulation in the academic calendars of the secondary schools and the colleges to facilitate acceleration of total educational progress";

(4) That the Commission disapproves the granting of more credit hours in accelerated programs than are normally granted by the institution for the same period of time. It is understood that the accepted standard for a semester hour is sixteen clock hours of instruction, or the usual laboratory equivalent. It is further understood that the minimum requirement for a baccalaureate degree is one hundred twenty semester hours or the equivalent, as stated in Standard Two;

(5) That, in brief, the national emergency emphasizes the need for thoroughly trained men and women and does not at this time seem to necessitate a reduction in the amount or quality of work required for entrance to and graduation from institutions of higher education;

(6) That under the accelerated program where terms of teaching service are extended, such extensions should be accompanied by fair and reasonable adjustments of salaries, and teachers should not engage in too long continuous periods of teaching;

(7) That since not all institutions of higher education are equipped to offer summer work, the institutions experienced in such work coöperate to the extent of enrolling, for the summer *only*, students from those colleges not attempting such work;

(8) (a) That for students who leave college to enter the armed forces, credit for war service be awarded only to individuals, upon completion of their service, who meet such tests as the institution may prescribe;

(b) That for students who leave college to enter the armed forces, credit for incomplete college work be awarded only to individuals who meet such tests as the institution may prescribe; it is recognized that in the case of seniors within their last term or semester, some departure from the practice, on an individual basis, may be justified.

(9) That a special committee be appointed to coöperate with the Ameri-

\* See "Standard One, for Colleges of Arts and Sciences and Teacher Training Colleges," page 224, SOUTHERN ASSOCIATION QUARTERLY, Vol. VI, No. 1, February 1942.—EDITOR.

can Council on Education in its efforts to maintain adequate teaching personnel in the institutions of higher education;

(10) That the program of physical education be given greater emphasis, and that special attention be given to student health, nutrition, and physical fitness;

(11) That the proper authorities in our Federal Government be requested to unify and coördinate the operation of the Selective Service Law and the various plans of enlistment in the several branches of the armed forces and in special services with regard particularly to college students and faculty members, in order that a unity and a common pattern of procedure may be established to the greater good of the nation and its educational institutions;

(12) That the proper authorities in our Federal Government be requested to establish a definite and clearly interpreted general policy with regard to occupational deferment for college students and faculty members, in the interest of uniformity of practice by the local draft boards.

The two following resolutions were, by action of the Commission and the Conference, added to the recommendations of the Executive Council:

(13) That the following statement and recommendations of the National Conference of College and University Presidents on Higher Education and the War, held in Baltimore, Maryland, January 3-4, 1942, be approved:

*Allocation of Total Man Power*

The surest and quickest route to victory is the full, energetic, and planned use of all our resources and materials. Where shortages may develop, both efficiency and the principles of equality require that the government take steps in advance to allocate resources to meet total needs, with a fair distribution of sacrifice. This is at present being done with material such as rubber, aluminum, and tin. It is clear that productive man power is also an area in which critical shortages are already evident. Therefore, it is recommended that:

(a) Institutions of higher education coöperate to the fullest extent with the National Resources Planning Board and other federal agencies responsible for surveys (a) to determine the immediate needs of man power and woman power for the essential branches of national service—military, industrial, and civilian, (b) to determine the available facilities of colleges and universities to prepare students to meet these needs, and (c) to appraise the ultimate needs in professional personnel for long-term conflict and for the post-war period, in order that a continuous and adequate supply of men and women trained in technical and professional skills and in leadership to meet both immediate and long-range needs shall be maintained;

(b) There be brought to the attention of the President the necessity of



issuing a statement of national policy which will avoid competitive bidding for faculty and students by government agencies and by industry and will conserve adequate personnel on all levels of education to assure the effective instruction of youth and adults, in order to provide a continuous supply of trained men and women;

(14) That the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools offer the services of our organization as a body and the equipment and personnel of our individual institutions for use in any way that may seem best by our government toward the winning of the war, and that we tender our services to the government as an organization and as individual institutions to help work out the best way the colleges of the South may serve at this time; and, further, that the Chairman of the Commission be authorized to appoint a committee to draft proper resolutions expressing the sense of this motion to be sent to the President of the United States, General Marshall, Admiral Stark, and Mr. Donald Nelson.

The following resolution, submitted by the Executive Council of the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education, was duly approved by the Commission and the Conference.

#### *A Resolution*

For many years the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools has labored unremittingly for reasonable uniformity in standards of achievement as the basis for the granting of degrees. During the first and second decades of this century there were institutions in this region which granted Bachelor's degrees for only one or two years of bona fide college work. The result was confusion as to the meaning of college on the part of students, their parents, and the general public. After strenuous efforts over a long period, this unfortunate situation has been largely eliminated.

In view of these facts this Commission, therefore, deplores any proposal, particularly under war-time conditions, to award the bachelor's degree at the close of the junior college or of the sophomore year after only two years (or less) of college beyond the secondary school. Such practice must lead inevitably to widespread misunderstanding and confusion and result in cheapening the significance of the time-honored and widely recognized baccalaureate degree. There is no objection on the part of this Commission to the use of the Associate in Arts title or degree for the completion of the equivalent of a two-year collegiate course of study, but it urges that the baccalaureate degree should continue to signify the completion of the equivalent of a four-year collegiate course of study.\*

\* For comment see Editorial Notes, pages 316 ff. and 335 f., this issue.—EDITOR.

# The Interpretation of the Spirit of Democracy —By Religion\*

BY UMPHREY LEE

*President, Southern Methodist University*

Every conference these days is devoted to discussions of democracy, and the public prints are full of dissertations concerning the disease and possible death of our form of government. There is, of course, nothing unusual about direful predictions; it is our national habit to clean our linen in public. "The noise you hear," said Mr. Dooley during the administration of Theodore Roosevelt, "is not the first gun of a revolution. It's only the people of the United States beating a carpet." And he added salutary comment. "The housecleaning season is in full swing, and there's a good deal of dust in the air; but I want to say to them neighbors of ours, who're peeking in and making remarks about the amount of rubbish, that over in our part of the world we don't sweep things under the sofa."

But part of our disease is owing to the frontal attack that is being made upon democracy. We have so long taken for granted that the whole world is moving with one increasing democratic purpose, that we have felt free to criticise to our heart's content, even to play with the idea that perhaps democracy itself is coming to an end. But now that our way of life is being attacked both by arms and ideas, we are frantically seeking to set our house in order and to reconvince ourselves that the stars in their courses fight on our side.

This program, I take it, has been designed to follow up John Dewey's suggestion that "we need to examine every one of the phases of human activity to ascertain what effect it has in release, maturing and fruition of the potentialities of human nature," which is, I believe, an essential of democracy as Professor Dewey understands it.<sup>1</sup> I am to explore the interpretation of democracy by religion, and I am assuming that "interpretation" does not mean singing "God Bless America" at every service or leading the children in three rousing cheers for the "democratic way of life." There is, indeed, some need for exploration and especially for definition, for every writer of magazine articles and public commentator on other people's business is doing sleight-of-tongue tricks with the phrase, "religion and democracy." Writers, who in the Twenties were damning those who would not accept salvation by science but persisted in believing that ethical ideas and religious faith still count in this world, are now explaining how America must have a

---

\* An address delivered before the Forty-sixth Annual Meeting of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, Louisville, Kentucky, December 4, 1941.

<sup>1</sup> John Dewey. "Democracy and Human Nature," *Freedom and Culture*, New York, 1939.



religious foundation for democracy. And, needless to say, many of them do not know what they are talking about.

In the first place, all religious people are not democrats, not even in the sense in which my father might have subscribed to that statement. As a matter of fact, there have been religious people, even religious people in the tradition of Western Christianity, who have lived under the Caesars or under the czars and have not believed it necessary to find another form of government. There are, moreover, Christians today who subscribe to the political doctrines of either the Communists or the Nazis, as can easily be seen by perusing the writings of the Dean of Canterbury and of Friedrich Gogarten. If one talks about democracy and religion, therefore, one must be specific as to the religion one means and as to the interpreters of that religion whom one approves.

In the second place, it should be understood that certain characteristics of the historic religion which all of us in the West inherit in some form are at variance with what some people understand as democratic processes. One may as well start with a paragraph from the very essay which I have quoted earlier. Farther along in his stimulating chapter on "Democracy and Human Nature," in the book *Freedom and Culture*, Dewey writes:

The real trouble is that there is an intrinsic split in our habitual attitudes when we profess to depend upon discussion and persuasion in politics and then systematically depend upon other methods in reaching conclusions in matters of morals and religion, or in anything where we depend upon a person or group possessed of "authority." We do not have to go to theological matters to find examples. In homes and in schools, the places where the essentials of character are supposed to be formed, the usual procedure is settlement of issues, intellectual and moral, by appeal to the "authority" of parent, teacher, or textbook.

Dewey goes on to point out that this procedure is likely to result in the development of anti-democratic attitudes, for it is the use of anti-democratic ways to achieve democratic ends.

Now we shall agree, to save argument, that no one advocates the "father-is-right" or the "thus-saith-the-book" way of teaching either morals or arithmetic; but the cleavage in thought goes deeper than this. I am doing no injury to one of the greatest of American thinkers when I point out that what is really involved is not simple technique but the existence of any ultimate authority, even that sanctioning the dictum that there *should* be the possibility of the "release, maturing, and fruition of potentialities of human nature."

I am not for the moment arguing the truth or falsity of the position that nowhere must one accept any final authority. Certainly, I am not capable of passing upon the pedagogical controversy as to whether children should

ever accept statements upon authority. I admit that I have had my trust in certain modern methods sadly shaken. I have seen my own child much perplexed because he had been taught that he was to pursue the truth together with his teacher; but when he came to the end of the pursuit, he found that the answer was in the back of the book and that no amount of further pursuit of the truth and no ingenuity in that pursuit would permit him to arrive at any other solution. Whether he would have been equally troubled if he had been told in the first place that there was only one answer and that had been determined before he was born, I do not know. Such mysteries are too deep for me.

Concerning such religion as we have inherited in this Western world, I may speak with more confidence. In religion there is an authority which can not be done away. If, therefore, to serve democracy, first principles of all kinds and in all fields must be arrived at without any consideration of a Divinely Given, the historical religion of the Western world might as well be left out of account—as indeed it has been by many. There have, it is true, been attempts to “democratize theology.” Bishop Francis J. McConnell records the statement of the gentlemen who, having listened carefully to an uncompromising exposition of Calvinistic predestination, announced that God might foreordain people in the East to everlasting punishment, but the folks in Arkansas wouldn’t stand for it. At the present time the most conservative would admit that moral codes are in large part socially determined, and that there is no little relativity in moral ideas. And most liberals would now hold that there is moral finality. Like Chesterson, they believe that if you are going to do away with Right and Wrong you might also dispense with Right and Left. In short, it can now be said of most American Christians that both conservatives and liberals agree that some moral principles are ultimates, as, for instance, the principle that this world is intended for the “release, maturing, and fruition of human potentialities,” or as it was put somewhat earlier, “This earth was not built for a chaos, but was designed as an habitation for men.”

All this, I hasten to say, has not been to subject you to a theological lecture, but to approach more honestly the question as to religion’s interpretation of democracy.

We are ourselves so familiar with both democracy and Western religion that it is difficult for us to separate the essentials from the accidentals. But if one turns to those who are attacking the validity of the democratic idea, it is possible to see democracy and religion in new perspective. A distinguished Italian scholar says of Fascism that it is “the first unqualified substitution of the idea of power for the idea of justice in the record of man.” Now, this may not be literally true; and, on the other hand, one cannot claim “justice” as an exclusively Christian idea. But the statement gets at the kernel of the matter. Our Western tradition, in large measure determined by the



Christian tradition, had exalted justice, in some way defined, above brute force; and a return to the logic of brute force is a denial of the ethic both of Christianity and of the Greco-Roman tradition.

But we can get a little closer to the matter through the attack made upon what is called the Judeo-Syriac religion by certain Nazi propagandists. In his widely-read *Myth of the Twentieth Century*, Rosenberg draws a sharp line between what he holds to be the German and the Christian ethic. According to Rosenberg, the German has as his supreme values honor and duty, while the Christian holds to an ethic of love, meaning humility, subjection, asceticism. The one enables the Germanic peoples to be bound together in a racial state, which Rosenberg holds the only possible one in the modern world; while the other ethic, that of Christianity, prepares people only for the universalism, the humanitarianism, the individualism of a democracy.

I have used Rosenberg's book for illustration because it has been very popular in Nazi Germany. But it might just as well have been some other books. The Christian doctrine of love has been chosen for attack everywhere an ethic of pride and military ardor has been exalted. Of course, one need spend no time in answering the charges that Christian love has always meant submissiveness, or even pacifism. The facts of history take care of such assertions. And every intelligent student of the New Testament or of the Church's record knows that Christian love has been truly interpreted, not by the sentimentalists, but by those who hold it against the background of the sterner virtues.

The important fact for our purpose is, however, that the opponents of democracy see the Christian ethic as peculiarly the ethic of democracy. And there is reason for this. Recently there has been much said about the inadequacy of what is called Puritan ethics for an urbanized society, and several gentlemen with more courage than historical information have tried to create an ethic out of equal parts of Benjamin Franklin and Epictetus, spiced with dashes of Plato, *et al.* Actually, the Christian ethic itself arose in an urbanized society. It was not the product of the idyllic countryside of Renan's imagination but was a synthesis of the Hebrew morality and the social insights of Jesus supplemented by the experiences of the early Church and of its leaders, such as St. Paul, in the crowded districts of the Mediterranean cities. The Christian ethic is the ethic of cities, of living together with people in an urbanized world. As one of the greatest Christian scholars America ever saw, Professor Arthur Cushman McGiffert, used to say: the Christian religion is personal, and the Christian ethic is social.

Now, the Fascist, and with him the Communist in his practical working, offers an alternative to Democracy, that of a racial State held together by power and recognizing as supreme values, honor and duty. Unquestionably, the problem of order in an urbanized society can be solved this way. On the other hand, democracy offers the ideals of universalism, as opposed

to racialism, of individualism in so far as consonant with social welfare, and of humanitarianism. In a democracy, these can be achieved only by the free coöperation of the people. Therefore, the ethic of democracy is of primary importance. Unless democratic people recognize these ideals and hold to them tenaciously, the democratic way of life is obviously doomed. And this is precisely the line of attack which the Fascist propagandist takes. He makes his first assault upon the Christian ethic, which he recognizes as the strategic center of the democratic state.

It has seemed to me that the shortest way to an understanding of one of the main connections between Christianity and democracy is to note the attacks being made upon democracy by her deadliest foes. This makes clear that, in the minds of shrewd observers of the modern scene, the ethical problem bulks large. It hardly seems necessary to labor this point. Surely we have heard the last of those who contended that the conquest of nature by scientific processes is the only need of man. Some day historians will argue as to whether human beings could ever have been so silly as to suppose that the social problem is not in large part ethical.

Now that we have touched briefly—and very inadequately—upon one of the chief points of attack by the enemies of democracy, let us ponder the raw fact that democracy is under attack. It is for others to consider the attacks upon democracy based upon its failure to go far enough. Of these there have been plenty. But our concern at the present is with those who assert that democracy *per se* is bad, that it is out-moded and must go, along with eight per cent interest and the hooped skirt. There have always been critics, of course, as those who remember their Carlyle well know; but now the criticism is from both the Left and the Right; and the criticism is implemented by the most formidable armies in history. We do not have time any longer to discuss whether democracy may not be extended more fully to the economic sphere or somewhere else: we are too busy trying to decide whether we shall have any democracy at all. When the winds blow and the floods descend the question is whether the house will stand, not whether the interior decorator has fumbled his colors.

Today the question whether democracy should be saved has become what the theologians call an "existential" question. It directly affects me and all that I have. It may mean the life or death of my son. Why should I risk everything to save democracy, to provide that there may be the "release, maturing, and fruition of the potentialities of human nature"? Here we are at the nub of the matter. "The case at bottom," says Mr. Laski, "is an ethical one. It postulates that the right to happiness is inherent in man as a member of society and that any system which denies that right cannot be justified."<sup>2</sup> And Mr. Dewey says the same. "We have to see that democracy means the belief that humanistic culture *should* prevail; we should

<sup>2</sup> "Democracy," *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences*.



be frank and open in our recognition that the proposition is a moral one—like any idea that concerns what *should* be.” And he means by humanistic culture, culture based on faith in the potentialities of human nature. But on what do we base our belief in human nature, on the right of people to be “happy (understood, of course, in the broad sense of the word)?”

Certainly, there is very little in the present scene to encourage such faith in human nature that we should risk our all upon it. If our novelists, glorying in their discoveries about human nature—discoveries which they might have found set forth in somewhat better English in the King James’ version of St. Paul’s Epistles—have not already done so, the stories of Rotterdam and of London and of the Russian front will surely convince us that man is a brutal and terrible creature.

It is true that some case for democracy may be made out from history. It would seem, on the whole, that democratic countries have done more to release the potentialities of human nature. But to hear our critics, particularly the starry-eyed idealists, we are wallowing in such a slough of iniquity that there is no health left in us. Of course, some of our most idealistic leaders seem to have gotten a democratic society on earth mixed up with the New Jerusalem, and some allowance should be made for that. But at the best democracy has not had time nor yet the quality of human intelligence and morality to achieve that society which would definitely prove the case.

The truth is that Dewey and Laski are right: at bottom this matter of democracy rests upon a moral choice; it is one of the things that we cling to because it *should* be. But, Mr. Dewey and Mr. Laski notwithstanding, the things to which men cling because they should be are those which men believe to have some ultimate character. In the statement written by the Founding Fathers, which is now coming again into fashion, it was said that “We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.” It is, of course, easy to quibble about the sincerity of this statement, but it is safer to assume that these men meant what they said. They believed that the rights for which they contended were written into the nature of things. In this instance it happened to be human nature, and we can no longer follow them in their psychology. But the essential point to remember is that these founders were not merely leading embattled farmers to protest against high taxes, they were standing for something that to their minds was an essential part of the scheme of things.

We have come to a time when the whole democratic conception is being thrown out by no small part of the nations of the world. It is true that this has not been a reasonable choice, for no nation with any considerable democratic experience has as yet deliberately rejected democracy. But neither is the attack upon democracy a mere incident in the imperialistic career of

the little Caesars. From Karl Marx to the latest confused despiser of the herd, there is an attack upon the idea of democracy which will not perish with the end of this war. It is essential, therefore, that we inquire whether our democratic notions are simply the products of our environment plus some suggestions from a classical education now rapidly disappearing, or whether democracy does correspond to something which we believe rooted in the nature of things.

Here religion has a word. For a very respectable part of the Christian world believes that Christianity teaches a regard for human personality which is not satisfied with the saving of the soul in a future paradise but demands the release of human potentialities here. Into the reasons for this belief there is no need to enter, for most of us here share it. And those of us who do believe that our religion has at its heart a conception of human personality which demands freedom and responsibility and brotherliness without racial determinants, hold to our democratic faith as something having a value beyond historical demonstration. It is a value which, as Sir Thomas Browne said of the soul, "was before us and will be after us."

Very briefly I have tried to suggest to you that religion, as interpreted by many in our Western world, is related to democracy in other than superficial ways. It is not, in short, a matter of Sunday school lessons on the democratic way of handling puppy dogs, nor even of the difference between a Baptist convention and a Methodist conference. The relations between religion and democracy are to be found in the fact that the moral teachings of Western religion at its best are essential to a democratic society, our enemies themselves being our witnesses; and in the further fact that these essentials are held by religious people not as a passing fashion but as obligations of divine sanction.

May I suggest, therefore, the profound but very simple truth, that our Western religion is at its best as an interpreter of democracy, when it is at its best as an interpreter of religion.



# The Interpretation of the Spirit of Democracy —By Industry\*

BY MARK ETHRIDGE

*Vice-President and General-Manager, The Courier-Journal and the Louisville Times*

We have a managing editor on *The Courier-Journal* who is a bug on semantics, picked up, I suppose, at Emory University. Wherever he got it, he insists upon reporters saying what they mean in words that cannot be misunderstood. I subscribe to his near-phobia to the extent that I believe heartily that when people recklessly fling around such generalities as democracy and liberty and freedom they ought to let other people understand what they mean by them. If you will forgive me, I am going to take a minute or two in an effort to do that.

Harold Laski said, in effect, that democracy is an effort to achieve self-realization by the removal of "all differentials by which other men exercise authority or influence which we do not ourselves possess." A more satisfactory definition to me is that it is the attachment to the ideal of liberty, or freedom, and the effort of man, through institutions of his own contriving, to affirm his own essence, his own being, his own dignity, his own right to share power with his fellow human beings.

As we have come to know democracy, it is the ancient ideal exemplified by the Greek city states, refined by the philosophies of Locke, Jefferson, Rousseau, Montesquieu, and Tocqueville and by the experiences of the self-governing nations. The English contributed the idea that parliamentary government is the parent of civil liberty. The French contributed the idea that there must be equality of opportunity, that autocracy is the necessary parent of special privilege, that for people to achieve their own self-government, it is necessary to remove every obstacle of capital or privilege that gets between them and their elected representatives. Our own contribution was the most radical of all: the idea that there is no divine foreordination to serve oppressive masters and that they can, and should be, overthrown when liberty opposes tyranny.

As I conceive it, democracy must be the continuing process of the adjustment of man to changing conditions, with fundamental devotion always to the ambition to enlarge and enrich his own freedom. When I talk, then, about the application of democracy to industry, it is that kind of democracy that I mean.

If my definition is correct, I think it must be conceded that what we had in America until the depression came was in fact a form of industrial

---

\* An address delivered before the Forty-sixth Annual Meeting of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, Louisville, Kentucky, December 4, 1941.

Fascism. One element of our population—a small element in numbers—came into the possession of undue economic and political power over the lives of all the rest of us. I have no desire to re-wash the dirty linen of that era in which we were growing recklessly as an industrial nation, but I can not give the setting for what I have to say unless we refresh ourselves a little on history.

It has not been too long ago for us to remember the activities of the representatives of capital in the political field. It was an era of greedy special legislation designed to benefit groups, rather than the people as a whole. To me, the ultimate in greed has always been the Smoot-Hawley tariff, passed in complete cynicism over the advice of most of the leading economists of the country. It was an era of unrestrained wild-cat financing, of secret rebates to shippers, of cut-throat financial and monopolistic practices and corruption of too many public officials.

Conversely, it was the era of ruthless brutalitarianism as far as the attitude of most industry toward organized labor was concerned. It was the era in which industries openly employed professional strike-breakers who had no concern whatever for the merit or the public interest involved, in which Pinkerton and Burns and other detective agencies brazenly furnished professional spies to join unions and report to companies upon their activities so that union members might be discharged, in which companies fostered their own unions so that they might control them and forestall honest organization, in which companies exchanged black lists of men who subscribed to the idea of unions, in which munitions were openly purchased and used by company police, in which the governments of at least several industrial centers of the country—one of them in this state—were openly controlled by industrialists.

It was, in fact, an era of strong capital, too little restrained by regulation and indeed subsidized by public benefits at the expense of the rest of us. Naturally, it was a period of weak labor, repressed and strongly regulated by such public policies as the use of injunction to prevent, or state troops to break up, strikes. But that era came to an end. We began to doubt that a good rating in Dun and Bradstreet was the highest testimonial to a man's ability to lead, or have power over us. As the depression closed down around us, we began to get angry in the recollection of so many of capital's sins and failures. I think it was fundamentally deeper than that: it was that we began to realize that as a people we could not deliver the power of government or of economics over to any favored group and expect to have anything better than the greedy exercise of it.

And so, with great fidelity to the pendulum theory, which is so marked a trait of our character, we began to "smack" down those whom we had elevated. We put the bridle on business through such institutions as the Securities and Exchange Commission; we decentralized the sources of financial power; and we brought industry under regulation. Again, in line with our



volatility, we began to use the legislative power to offset the power that is inherent in concentrations of capital.

In the social security laws, we discarded the notion that a code of business has a right to use workers when it pleases and make public charges of them when it no longer wants them. We wrote a code of the social responsibility of business. In the Norris-LaGuardia act, we outlawed the use of injunctions and gave labor its most effective weapon; under the NRA we established the forty-hour week and advanced the standard of living. In the Wagner Act, we actually extended to labor freedoms which we had denied or curtailed, directly or indirectly: the right to organize and bargain collectively, the right to speak freely without repression or coercion and the right to assemble without the fear of hoodlum force. All those measures were nothing more or less than the operation of democratic government; the use of the system of checks and balances. Moreover, they represented nothing more or less than simple justice and adherence to the basic idea of the dignity of the individual. I firmly believe that aside from jurisdictional disputes, labor trouble is caused, in ninety-nine cases out of one hundred, by the failure or refusal of the employer to recognize that fundamental right and by his insistence upon the feudalistic notion that he always knows better than his employees what is good for them.

It is certainly significant evidence of the ambition of the human spirit to have its own expression that, whereas the labor unions had less than four million members when they were shackled, they have recently passed the 10,000,000 mark.

There is nothing we have so far done to free trade unions from undemocratic restrictions which we should properly feel is a mistake. But there are many things for us to realize, to learn, and to do before we have established a real system of check and balances between capital and labor, before we have written a code for labor as we have for business. How far that code will go in its regulation is dependent upon how wisely labor uses the freedom which we have accorded it.

Unfortunately, it has fallen into many of the sins of capital. It is unfair and untrue to indict all of labor, just as it was unfair and untrue to indict all of capital when it held unrestrained sway. But, again unfortunately, the pattern of regulation is set by the criminals and the irresponsibles of society and not by the good citizens. Crooked bankers, stock swindlers, and financial exploiters determined very largely the degree of regulation which has been given all financial interests. Correspondingly, it will be the labor racketeers and the irresponsibles swollen with power who will determine the degree to which we curb the freedom we have granted.

If we had feudal lords in our exploiting era, we have petty dictators of labor now who have not had elections in their unions in years. If we had crooked bankers, we have crooked labor leaders who steal money from their

unions or sell them out. If we had hopeless bourbons in the financial class, we have too many labor men on the extreme opposite wing who have no primary interest in this country and its democracy, and no more allegiance to the principle of freedom than the hopeless Tories. If we had improper concentrations of capital in the hands of financiers, we have concentrations of capital in the hands of a great many union leaders, for which no accounting is made. If we had greed then, we have too many evidences of greed now. If we had arrogance and lust for power then, we have had the strongest evidence of arrogance and lust for power in men like John L. Lewis.

It will not be short of tragic if labor does not realize that there was more than anger in placing restrictions upon business. There was involved the deep realization that our salvation as a people does not lie in the hands of one group, but in the hands of all of us. Labor was misled into thinking that the government was its partisan because the original administrators of the Wagner Act mis-administered it. They had too much zeal to organize unions and too little zeal for the role of impartial referees to guarantee and secure the right to organize if workers desired it. A great deal of the swing-back in sentiment against labor may be traced to that mal-administration. It was never the purpose of the people of this country to have the government organize unions. The purpose was to guarantee that free election on the part of the individual which is the essence of democracy; that freedom which must be *really* free of coercion on the part of either the employer or the union organizer.

Those who do not understand *that* do not understand the history or the character of the American people. We may pass through eras of aberrations, but we always come back to the underlying determination that those of us who have no special interests shall govern America. There cannot possibly be more than 5,000,000 capitalists or managers of capital in this country. There are, as I said 10,000,000 union members. If we stretch the point to say that all their families are either capitalists or union adherents, there are still some 80,000,000 people in the United States, the consumers of the products of both capital and labor, who have allegiance to neither in the operation of our governments. It is in the long run the voice of the 80,000,000 which will be heard, and heeded, in Washington.

The real determination of how far we shall go in legislation will be made by labor leadership itself; by how wisely it leads and by how strongly it recognizes its place and its responsibility in a democratic country. I have no sympathy whatever with any effort to withdraw from labor any fundamental right which it has won. Unfortunately, leaders of the Lewis type have played into the hands of those who would like to take us back to the pre-Wagner days. Wise leadership would have outlawed strikes in defense industries by accepting voluntary mediation or arbitration in good faith. Personally, I believe it would have been welcomed by the rank and file, and



because I do believe that, I feel that the rank and file member can blame the stupidity of his own leadership for what happened in Congress yesterday. If labor is puzzled by that vote and by the resentment it represents, it is because it has forgot what the country has not forgot, the only good thing that Calvin Coolidge ever said: "There is no right to strike against the public safety."

Nothing better could happen for the country than for labor to announce its voluntary good-faith acceptance of mediation or arbitration in defense industries as of today and for Congress then to go through its own cooling off period before it undertakes to write a code of labor legislation. Failure to do that means that we shall undertake, in a period of emergency and in an atmosphere of anger, to do what should not have to be done at all, what could have been averted.

But it is not of any legislation of the moment that I am thinking. It is of a permanent application of democracy to industry. As labor expands its power we shall write its code of regulation. There is nothing sinister in that; it is the way we have always operated. We are a country deeply committed to the principle of the control of monopolies of the essentials of life. No labor leader in his right mind could possibly imagine, as Mr. Lewis apparently did imagine, that he could obtain a monopoly upon the production of one of our most vital necessities without coming under the same sort of regulations to which monopolies of capital must submit. The closed shop, even in its local-union application, is a monopoly; when it is extended on a national scale and results in absolute control of a vital industry, such as coal production, or railroads, it becomes a matter of great import to our society and our well being; and it cannot long escape the same scrutiny which monopolistic business has.

Furthermore, no labor leader who knows the history of this country could imagine for a moment that a people who, through their representatives in Congress, fix the methods of election, the duties, the responsibilities and the penalties for failure to perform them, of bank directors, would fail eventually to fix the methods of election, the responsibilities and the penalties for failure to perform them of union officers. Which is to say that is perfectly in the pattern of the American people to require unions to follow democratic processes of election, and to require an accounting of finances not merely for the protection of members, but for the safeguarding of the public. We are not a people who bestow economic power—and unions have it in a marked degree—and let it run riot forever. We have protected the stockholders of banks and railroads against wildcatting by the managers of invested capital; we shall undoubtedly get around to protecting the rank-and-file union member against those who would mismanage his affairs.

Although I believe compulsory arbitration is some time off, unless bad labor leadership forces the country to adopt it during the emergency, I do

believe that some form of peaceful settlement of labor disputes is inevitable. When labor was battling its way against public policy and largely against public sentiment; when every crooked or evasive device by industrial Tories was permitted, the right to strike was an absolute essential. But new factors have entered the picture. In the first place, the principle of arbitration has already had wide acceptance by unions and employers who have dealt with each other for a long time and trust each other. In the second place, the wider acceptance by employers of the principle of collective bargaining will reduce the area of industrial trouble to recalcitrants on both sides. The few employers and unions which resort to coercion to settle their disputes will be the exceptions, rather than the rules; they will be, in effect, the enemies of society, and society will do something about them.

I say again that it is perfectly in the pattern of our development and of our philosophy to establish at some time in the future tribunals for peaceful settlement. Our courts of law are the product of that philosophy. It used to be all right for men who had differences to settle them by shooting each other down, or for tribes to settle their anger in head-hunting sprees. In fairly recent times vigilantes and Klansmen felt they could resort to force with impunity. But a social consciousness tells us now that nobody has a right to use force when it has an effect upon society as a whole. We established courts of law for peaceful settlements of differences and outlawed the toe-to-toe slugging. It has been part of the evolution of our society; it is a philosophy that will be written into labor-industry relations. A dispute which threatens to tie up a milk supply, or a transportation system, or long distance lines or any other service essential to all the rest of us will, I venture, be settled as peacefully as a dispute over a land line or a cord of wood.

Nor do I believe that we will go on tolerating for long the senseless jurisdictional disputes in which the public is the real sufferer, or the uneconomic levying of needless costs which the public must pay through the stand-by or made-work demands of a few unions. Those demands are already under the scrutiny of the anti-trust division of the department of justice.

Nor can labor *practice*, and *still pretend* to be democratic, the exclusion of minorities from its membership. To the great credit of most of the unions, it must be said that no exclusion is practiced. But twenty-four constituent unions of the American Federation of Labor exclude Negroes either by constitution or ritual from membership. I have lately been serving as chairman of the government's Fair Employment Practice Committee. The Committee came into being to investigate a great number of complaints that, although the country was engaged in a great and desperate effort to enlist in industry every man who could run a machine or use a hammer or paint brush, great numbers of the so-called minority groups, including the Jews, the people of Spanish decent, the Japanese to whom we have given citizenship, some of them third generation Americans, and Negroes, were



being discriminated against. Unfortunately we found too many of the complaints true.

We have a notorious case in which one of the largest employers of labor refused to hire Jews, but offsetting that we have a notorious case in which a union refused to certify skilled Negroes for employment on a badly-needed defense project in a Northern city. My own observation has been that discrimination has known no bounds of bank accounts; its roots are as deep as the prejudice from which it springs. Discrimination in employment, or in admission to unions, is one of the realities we must face in any application of democracy to industry. We have held up this country as one in which the oppressed might have opportunity. We can not pretend to have given that full opportunity or to have a democracy until we realize that the aspirations of human beings for freedom and economic security are the same, regardless of race or creed or national origin.

We cannot afford to furnish a fertile ground for the resentment and bewilderment of a people who find themselves excluded from the defense of a country on which they have centered their hopes of a better life, nor, when this emergency is over, can we go on denying by our actions the very things for which we have fought. I know no group which has a greater responsibility than this one. The boys and girls whom you are educating will have to face the question whether this nation is in truth democratic or whether, while renouncing and fighting the Herrenvolk theory, it still embraces it in its economic practices.

I have dealt with only one restricted phase of democratic application. We shall have democracy in industry only as we give devotion to the basic ideal, only as our industrialists accept the principle of collective bargaining in good faith, and only as the unions expand their democracy along with their expanding power—or again, only in that degree to which the impartial and detached among us insist that we shall use the legislative power to correct any imbalances or perversions of the democratic method. We have the unassailable thesis that those who enjoy the benefits of democracy must yield to its controls and its safeguards.

# The Interpretation of the Spirit of Democracy —By the Schools

BY CHARLES E. FRILEY,  
*President, Iowa State College*

There is an old and perhaps familiar story to the effect that Benjamin Franklin was entertaining a European friend when the news of the ratification of the Federal Constitution reached him. "Is it a monarchy or a republic?" his visitor eagerly inquired. "A republic—if we can keep it," was the prompt reply.

This observation of the staunch old American statesman seems particularly pertinent in these days when the full resources of the United States have been mobilized for the titanic struggle to safeguard the nation and the American way of life in the current world upheaval. It is a mobilization of far greater extent, scope and significance than any other in our history. Ultimately it will affect directly and deeply every citizen of the republic, in ways that are strange and under conditions that will make post-war individual and national adjustments far from easy.

In general we have been alarmingly slow to grasp the real and sinister import of the world revolution that is flaming in every direction. It is political, economic, social and spiritual. Its fires are creeping nearer and nearer to our shores, and from time to time we are called upon to help choke an incipient or actual blaze that has broken out in some unexpected spot within our midst, or in some lonely outpost, or in the tortuous by-ways of our sister republics in this half of the globe. The incendiaries are crafty, sinister, ruthless, brutal, fanatical, and possessed of a deadly persistence that makes them a constant and a deadly danger. Their professed aims are clear and unmistakable: to destroy the form and substance of government of which the United States of America is the foremost exemplar, together with the traditions, the culture, the freedom and the way of life which are its cherished symbols, and which are the beacon lights to which literally hundreds of millions of people are today looking hopefully, even through their suffering, their desperation, and their despair.

Specifically, we as a people have at stake in this mortal struggle the fate of our free institutions, and the fate of those priceless rights, opportunities and obligations which are the essence of democracy. Specifically, the only realistic and intelligent answers to the challenge and the danger are: (1) a land, naval, and air force adequate to meet and crush any threat to our safety and fundamental rights from any quarter; (2) the efficient organization of

---

\* An address delivered before the Forty-sixth Annual Meeting of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, Louisville, Kentucky, December 4, 1941.



our economic and industrial resources to assure a continuous and ample flow of the materials essential to comprehensive and sure defense; (3) full and courageous mobilization of the intellectual, moral, and spiritual resources of the people to meet the most subtle and demoralizing of all the threats to our peace and security—the activities of those individuals and groups, both within and without our borders, who through ignorance or deliberate design are trying to undermine the faith of the American people in their way of life and in the strength, the value, and the permanence of their institutions and ideals.

This latter element in an adequate defense is fully as important as the maintenance on a high plane of the military and economic elements; in some respects it is even more important. The tragic fate of France is a terrible illustration of this fact; the heroic and thrilling stand of England and China against apparently insuperable odds is a tremendously heartening example of the same fact.

It is with this third sphere of action—the concentration and effective use of our intellectual, moral, and spiritual resources—that the schools of the nation are fundamentally and primarily concerned. Not only the schools, but all other agencies—church, home, civic bodies and every loyal American—have a vital interest in this area. Because of the divergent, elusive, and often unpredictable human aspects of the problem, it is clearly the most difficult of solution. And because of its very difficulty many of our people seem to despair of finding any sound and stable answer. Certainly the answer is not to be found in our amazing indifference, in our tendency to put our faith in specious slogans, or in our willingness to shift the responsibility to self-appointed and often self-seeking false prophets and saviors, either individuals or groups. It will be found only through the influence of enlightened and inspired public opinion, intelligently and unselfishly directed and courageously applied.

What is this democracy—this form and spirit of government—that is now faced with a mortal challenge? Perhaps the simplest and best way to discover its meaning and to discern something of its spirit is to recall what great men have said about it. The English barons who secured the Magna Carta at Runnymede were aristocrats, but they recognized and prized an essential element in democracy when they demanded government according to law in place of arbitrary action by the king. The authors of the Declaration of Independence defined democracy as a government deriving its just powers "from the consent of the governed." To the framers of the Constitution of the United States it meant "to establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare and secure the blessings of liberty" for themselves and their descendants. The objectives of the leaders of the French revolution were "liberty, equality, and fraternity," now renounced and denounced by those who for the time being profess to speak for the French people.

Thomas Jefferson said in his first inaugural that democracy betokened "equal rights for all" and special privileges for none. John Marshall, discussing the Federal constitution in 1788, said the vital maxims of democracy are "a strict observance of justice and public faith and a steady adherence to virtue." Lincoln, at Gettysburg, described democracy as "conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal." Pasteur held it to be "that form of government which leaves each man free to contribute his best to the general welfare." Mazzini defined it as "the government of all through all under the leadership of the wisest and best."

Although not so strong today as in former years, there has been too much of a tendency in this "age of objectivity" to make democracy a matter of form and to identify it with mechanical devices and processes. But the *spirit* of democracy is of its very essence. If we nourish and cherish this spirit, we shall not experience any serious difficulties with problems of mechanics. But if we neglect it or starve it, there are no forms or machines that can save us.

The most essential things about any political or social system are the ideals and values in which people believe. Democracy has so many important elements, tangible and intangible, that it is difficult to get them into a few words. The combination of these elements is the significant thing, and the best phrase for the combination seems to be a "way of life"—the free way. The new despotisms of this modern, enlightened age claim that the future lies with them because they represent the "master races" of the earth. In contrast, the democracies represent what may be termed the "master idea" in this world—that of the freedom of the individual.

Democracy is essentially a belief in the dignity of man, and confidence in the progressive development of the possibilities latent in human personality. It assumes that government exists for man rather than man for government. It holds that most people are possessed of good will, and it argues that "the gains of humanity are mass gains," to which all ranks and conditions of men may have legitimate access. As the basis for order, justice, and liberty, the democratic creed calls for equality of opportunities and obligations for all citizens of the commonwealth. It emphasizes "the value of decisions arrived at by rational processes and by common counsel, with the implications of tolerance and freedom of discussion rather than violence and brutality." Above all, it proclaims the spirit of fraternity and the common good, placing the general above the individual welfare.

These are the ideals, the spirit of democracy, for which we have struggled through many generations. But what has happened? Our cherished principles of thought and action, our moral code, our political, economic, and social institutions are today treated with scorn and contempt by fanatical and implacable enemies. Brutal and merciless force has displaced the rule of reason. The great religions of the world are despised and assailed be-



cause they call for faith in an overruling Providence, who, under the totalitarian ideology, must of necessity be the dictator's rival and competitor. In place of tolerance and common counsel, the tyrant has substituted his own irrational and violent emotion. Through absolute control of schools, the processes of education, and the means of public enlightenment, he has distorted and poisoned the minds of his subjects and has developed a fanatical faith in the so-called new order that makes his young men and women throw their lives blindly upon the altars of their false gods.

Thus in one short decade we have learned in the tragic way how easy it may be to conquer and rule the world when cold intellect and merciless force, backed by the modern machine and devoid of all moral and religious scruples, go on the warpath. But with equality in physical and material resources now assured, there is every reason to believe that those peoples having the deeper moral convictions and the more fervent religious faith will triumph in the end.

It has been well said that a sound program of universal public education is basically the strongest and most enduring common defense that the American people have built or can build. The fact that the dictator has promptly and ruthlessly suppressed the educational system in every conquered nation is clear admission that liberal and popular education is one of the most dangerous enemies of the totalitarian philosophy. It is clear admission that freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of study and inquiry, freedom of worship, and freedom of action must be crushed if the dictator's will is to prevail. It is clear admission that universal education is the most powerful instrument ever placed in the hands of man in his struggle for emancipation.

In the defense of democracy and in the interpretation of its spirit, we must adopt the military maxim that the best defense is a strong offensive action, because democracy is a positive philosophy rather than a negative one. Acting on that principle, American education has in the past year assumed the offensive in a reasonably intelligent manner. It is solving the problem of training an adequate number of workers for our rapidly expanding industrial activities, it is moving vigorously in the effort to coördinate its staff and facilities with those aspects of the defense program in which it may be of service. But this is not enough. As responsible leaders of educational thought and action, the schools must take the offensive against passive and indifferent loyalty, against outright disloyalty and subversive activities, against inactive and uninformed citizenship, easy living and useless, outworn, or questionable educational traditions and processes.

From a leader of the courageous little country of Czechoslovakia there recently came this statement:

"Our country has been overwhelmed by superior military force, but our democracy will never be imperilled by outside attacks. Democracy

is always weakened from within. Only its own feebleness or complacency destroys it. We in Europe see more clearly than you that democracy dies from lack of discipline, unwillingness to compromise, group pressure, corruption, usurpation of public power, or because the public is greedy and indifferent. It dies unless it draws life from every citizen. Denouncing dictators gets nowhere. The job of those who believe in the democratic process is to be positive, not negative, to build it up, expose, and correct its mistakes, to keep it alive and vigorous in times of peace, in times of storm, in times of stress."

How, then, can we interpret the spirit of democracy, its ideals, its aspirations, its positive and constructive character, to the thirty million boys and girls, young men and women, enrolled in our schools, whose educational activities, whose thinking, and whose philosophy of life mean so much to the future of this nation and to the world? It is hardly to be expected that there can be found an answer to this problem which would be accepted by all of us. But there are certain factors that seem essential to success.

1. The home and the church have a clear responsibility for helping provide a sound moral and ethical basis upon which the schools can develop an understanding and appreciation of democratic ideals and processes.

2. The schools and colleges can well afford to rid themselves of the idea that young people as a group are fundamentally different from the rest of society. On the contrary, it should be made clear that they are an important and essential part of the people, sharing their work and their play, their achievements and their responsibilities, according to their abilities. Schools are likely to do their students a disservice when they encourage them in the assumption that adult life, with its civic obligations, does not really begin until a person reaches the age of 25, 30, or 40. Freedom is not easy; democracy is the most difficult form of government, achieving progress only through the fullest coöperation of every citizen. The sooner our boys and girls appreciate this fact, the better for the nation and for them. What we ought to aim for is "young maturity"—and we can achieve it without taking the joy and happiness out of their lives.

3. Students should understand that the citizens of a democracy have the right to expect every reasonable freedom—but never freedom from responsibility. This is a lesson that many adults have yet to learn. William L. Shirer recently said that it is the mark of a fascist to "want things both ways." Students should further understand that no wizardry of mechanical checks and balances can relieve them of the necessity of keeping track of what their public officials do. Only the vigilance of the citizen will assure visibility in the government.



4. Democracy means self-criticism; that is, vigorous criticism of the weak spots in the social order by its members, but this criticism should always be in the spirit of "His Majesty's Loyal Opposition." It should never mean intransigence. The schools ought to generate in their students a disposition to coöperate with anyone who will agree with them approximately half of the way.

5. As a partial antidote to those special groups and interests whose activities are often inimical to the general welfare and the common good, we should demonstrate to our young people that what is desirable for the public must be good for every legitimate interest group included within that public. The members of these groups must therefore readily acknowledge the priority of the common welfare, always and everywhere.

6. The schools and colleges can make a major contribution by vigorously encouraging in their students a firm belief in America and in all for which America stands. There are still many people who have the colonial attitude of mind, which, as Raymond Clapper recently said, keeps them thinking that "the British are too smart for us."

7. The spirit of democracy must be exhibited on four levels and that simultaneously. We as good Americans must show ourselves good citizens of the locality, the state, the nation, and the world. In their interpretation of this aspect of democracy, the schools can probably make their largest contribution by stressing the significance of the first and the last of these four citizenships. The spirit of democracy is universal in its genius; so if it is confined within the geographical boundaries of the nation it will ultimately die. It is born in the home community, but it cannot develop and prosper unless it has the opportunity to grow throughout the world community.

8. It is essential that the student understand the fundamental differences between democratic and totalitarian philosophy. The dictator has been remarkably successful in inoculating many people with the myth of totalitarian invincibility. But its inherent and decisive weaknesses, which are becoming daily more apparent, were well stated in a recent address by the President of Brown University:

a. Totalitarianism represents the dominance of political over economic objectives—because its purpose is power for the state, and not wealth for its subjects;

b. It represents the triumph of military objectives over civil life; its ideal is war, not peace;

c. Its program means the impoverishment of physical life. There are no vitamins in guns; and when guns displace butter long enough, the policy will exact its inevitable physical toll;

d. It means economic impoverishment, because its main productive forces are turned into destructive channels, fashioning things

that produce no goods, and on a scale which taxation can never meet;

e. It means intellectual impoverishment, because bureaucratic control is necessarily hostile to intellectual freedom. When the mind of science, of literature, and of art is harnessed in team with the official mind, there is inevitably lost the freedom, the sweep, and the reach which have brought science to its untold number of triumphs, which have brought richness and beauty and meaning and power to letters and the arts;

f. It means spiritual impoverishment because the state becomes your god, and the result is the same as if you fashioned an idol of gold or of clay. And when rigid control by others is substituted for mastery of yourself, there is a loss for which nothing can compensate.

In contrast, the strength of this nation is clearly evident when we consider our possessions and our opportunities:

1. We have a spiritual heritage, representing the aspirations, the sacrifices, and the sufferings of our forebears. Our guarantees of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness are dependent upon our determination to preserve and strengthen this heritage, of which religion, morality, and knowledge are the foundation stones.

2. We have vast wealth and unlimited natural resources; and we have the intelligence, the initiative, and the ingenuity to marshal these resources into irresistible agencies for present defense, as well as for the future development and extension of the democratic ideal, when peace comes again to this troubled world.

3. We have in principle a government of the people, conceived by courageous and intelligent men, to whom freedom was more important than any other consideration.

4. We have a great people, more than 132 million in number, springing from many races and adhering to many creeds. To develop the national unity of which we are in such great need is a task calling for the greatest wisdom and the most unselfish direction which our teachers, our ministers, our writers, our public officials, and our public-spirited laymen can provide. Such unity will depend largely upon our ability to clarify the goals and purposes of democracy, to reaffirm the faith of the American people in their own ideals, and to enlist the active aid of every citizen of this commonwealth in making these ideals and principles active ingredients in our daily lives and work.

In our present struggle to keep the republic, we have place only for faith, courage, and strength; for clear minds and firm wills; for ideas and ideals

stronger and more vital than those of the challenger. We have no place for doubt or defeat, hesitation or fumbling, or the attitude of appeasement. Democracy is a symphony, unfinished and incapable of being finished. It has no blueprint which, once satisfied, will bring its consummation or its doom. It is the way free men live together, and the way can be made richer and finer with each passing year.

The new despotisms lay claim to being revolutionary movements—harbingers of the future. They are in fact primitive and reactionary, for what they do is to beat a return to the oldest pattern in the long annals of government. Using the term in its best sense, democracy is the only system which is truly and permanently revolutionary—because it implies a continual evolution toward the good life for every citizen.

No educated and thoughtful person can sincerely believe that this is the endless night of despair closing down upon our day of fate. For morning and the bright sun await this side of the end of the world if you and I can inspire men and women to use all the constructive agencies of society in the all-important task of substituting faith for fear, of putting intelligence and rationality and spirituality into the glorious adventure of living.



# What the Schools Can Do to Provide Work Experience<sup>\*</sup>

BY G. D. HUMPHREY  
*President, Mississippi State College*

The subject, "What the Schools May Learn from Work Camps," has been ably discussed by my distinguished colleague of Alabama State Teachers College.†

The choice of the general subject, "Implications of Student Work Programs for Secondary Education," and the able discussion of the first division of the general subject are an admission that, to a certain extent, the secondary schools have not been as efficient as they should have been. It is also admitted that the educational activities of some of the governmental agencies with educational divisions have had, to a certain extent, the right educational philosophy back of their programs, even though their administration may have been costly and inefficient.

The division of the general subject assigned to me is "What the Schools Can Do to Provide Work Experience." The question is not only what can, but also what should, the secondary schools do about the problem that is before them both for discussion and for definite action.

If it is accepted that high school students should have work experience, it is necessary that a philosophy be stated. The philosophy would seem to be that education should be based in theory and practice upon experience. Granting this to be true, it goes without saying that the organized subject-matter of the specialist cannot provide the starting point. Education can not be imposed upon students from without and above. An education of this kind would impose adult standards, subject-matter, and methods upon those who are growing slowly to maturity. To imposition from above are opposed expression and cultivation of individuality; to external discipline is opposed free activity; to learn from texts and teachers is opposed learning through experience; to acquisition of isolated skills and techniques by drill is opposed acquisition of them as a means of attaining ends which make direct vital appeal to the student; and to set aims and materials is opposed acquaintance with a changing, moving, throbbing world of action.

One thing stands out in the idea that all education is experience, and that is that anything can be called a study if the materials fall within the scope of ordinary life-experience. All good education grows out of experience, but not all experience results in good education. Some experience is bad

---

<sup>\*</sup> An address delivered before the Commission on Secondary Schools, Louisville, Kentucky, December 2, 1941.

† See pages 282 to 285, this issue of the *QUARTERLY*.—EDITOR.

from an educational point of view because it distorts the individual. Experiences should be selected, directed, and organized by the student under the guidance of the teacher in order to give a regular, coherent growth to the individual so that he will develop without distortion. The part that school and teachers in the school should play is that of coöperative leadership. Work experiences should be selected that fall within the learning range of the student. From simple experiences the student will progress to experiences of a more complex character; however, the new and unknown experiences to be comprehended must be closely related to the past experiences of the student in order that a point of contact may be made available.

So much for the underlying philosophy. Out of it should emerge the following activities or results:

1. A guidance program for students who leave the elementary school to enter industry, without having entered high school, in order to provide continuation, part-time, and reading courses for the purpose of developing their personality and increasing their efficiency on the job.

2. The giving of high school credit for work, supervised by the teacher, that a student does outside of regular school hours during the time he is a matriculate in school.

3. The employment of students who have to leave school before graduation on projects where continuous courses by the school will permit the student eventually to graduate from his high school.

4. The employment of high-school graduates who do not enter college and who do not get jobs at once on public works programs under the supervision of the schools. This work experience, planned and executed, should better prepare the students for a specific trade.

5. A follow-up program of guidance and further training of high school graduates who enter industry or a vocation immediately after graduation. High school graduates who go directly to the job would have sufficient contact with business men or industry to enable them to secure initial employment, and advance in their chosen occupations. Actual work experience, as a student coördinates the activities of the school and industry, would give meaning to each in the life of the student, and afford him a further opportunity for self-improvement.

6. The provision for work experience for the high school student who expects to enter college that would give him a better insight into that interest, or those interests, from which he expects to earn a living in later life. Such work experience might mean guidance of the finest sort in helping the individual to choose a profession and make a success in that profession.

Instead of the development of a parallel school system directly controlled from Washington, all phases of these programs now in existence should be gradually incorporated into the school program under civilian administration.

The philosophy and results of a program of work experience have been stated. The question now arises: Is there a need for such a radical change from the high school curriculum now in vogue? The following figures from the U. S. Office of Education would seem to indicate that a need for a radical change does exist.

The Office of Education estimated that in 1941 there would be 1,200,000 students who would graduate from high school out of an enrollment of 7,000,000. This indicates that over a four-year period 2,200,000 students would enter high school who would not graduate—an average loss of 550,000 a year. Of those who would graduate, 400,000 would go to college; 100,000 would enter trade or post-secondary training schools; and more than 500,000 would enter industry with no trade training except that which was given in the formal high school courses. The 550,000 who would fail to graduate plus the 500,000 who would graduate and enter industry would mean that 1,000,000 students in one year would depend entirely on the high schools for all of the training by which they were to earn a living. Work experience in the high school is necessary if these people are to be really prepared to assume their places in the present-day mechanistic society.

Howard M. Bell, in his study, *Youth Tell Their Story*, published in 1938 by the American Council on Education, Washington, D. C., found that 54 per cent of the pupils leaving high school before graduation left for economic reasons. Of this 54 per cent, 34.1 per cent left school because of lack of family funds, 15.7 per cent desired to earn their own money, and 4.2 per cent needed to work at home. Of the total number leaving high school, 24.6 per cent left because of lack of interest. General lack of interest was the reason for the withdrawal of 20.6 per cent; disciplinary reasons constituted the cause of the withdrawal of 2.2 per cent; and subjects too difficult to master caused the other 1.8 per cent to leave school. The third great reason why some left school was the feeling that they had enough education. This accounted for 13.2 per cent.

Of the remainder, 3.2 per cent left school because of poor health, 3 per cent to marry, and 2 per cent for other reasons not given. From these figures it can be seen that 78.6 per cent of the students leaving high school before graduation left because of economic conditions and lack of interest in the offerings of the schools. The data indicate, first, that the secondary schools must provide work experience for those that are not economically able to attend school. This will involve providing sufficient financial aid to some who, if not assisted, would be forced to leave school. Second, the program of activities of the school must be made sufficiently attractive to hold the interests of students so that they will want to remain in school.



The data further indicate that for students preparing for the professions, the holding power of the schools is exceedingly strong. This is perhaps due to the fact that the traditional curriculum was developed for pre-professional students.

The time has come when the secondary school must look forward to a greater utilization of the scientific method in the development of the possibilities of growing, expanding experience. It sometimes takes a great catastrophe for weaknesses to show up in individuals and institutions. The national defense program has brought to the front the deficiencies of the secondary schools in the training of students to fit into a mechanical age. Conservatives and radicals agree that something is wrong with our secondary school curriculum. This is the one clear educational idea at this time that has emerged out of the national defense program.

It is generally agreed that existing facilities for vocational guidance and training are inadequate. Three-fourths of the high schools of the country are not equipped to provide highly diversified vocational programs other than in agriculture and home economics. One faces the fact that millions of young persons live under conditions that are a denial of the idea of the equality of opportunity and the challenge to make this idea a reality.

In the South the youth living in the small rural community does not have the opportunity to choose between schools with their multiple curriculums. On the other hand, the city youths have these advantages in addition to the opportunities to work during vacation and holidays. Yet many of these rural youths migrate to the neighboring urban centers and are destined to be absorbed in the semi-skilled occupations.

Education, in the true sense, is the will and the equipment for living at one's best every day of the individual's life and being able to make the lives of others a little bit happier and a little bit better by one's having lived. The will to be educated and to use education as it should be used is the first prerequisite of the individual in seeking to be better able to live a full life. To have the equipment of living a full life and not to have the will to accomplish something worthwhile is a tragedy. It is like having an automobile of the newest design without having an engine under the hood. One cannot travel in that sort of conveyance.

The first job of education, then, is to build a man who has both the desire and the ability to do well the problem that challenges his ingenuity. It is the responsibility of the secondary school to provide guidance, opportunities, and experience that will qualify the high school student or graduate to do some one job well, whether it be going to college or entering immediately one's lifework in a vocation. Since less than twenty-five per cent of the high school students matriculate in any college, the high school curriculum should give to the student the type of education that will enlarge and enrich his personality and make him capable of doing a specific job well.

It is the duty and the responsibility of the secondary school to give to that great majority of the students who never matriculate in a college the ability to live a full and happy life and be fitted to share in some of the world's richest rewards. Work experience in the secondary schools should be provided as it is now being provided in the inefficient experiments that are being tried out by the National Youth Administration and the Civilian Conservation Corps. The financial returns derived from enrollment in these two agencies have undoubtedly encouraged many youths to drop out of the organized school to seek additional training in an agency which enables the trainee to earn while learning. If we accept the data presented above, that fifty per cent drop out for economic reasons, then our schools of the future must make provisions for the economic casualties by providing work experience with compensation for services rendered. Such a program would take into account the financial need of the student. This would probably necessitate Federal aid in the form of subsidies or grants-in-aid that would equalize the opportunities of the individuals in the various regions of the country, for some of the communities could not finance the programs of work experience with pay for the students who needed it most. There must be incorporated into our secondary curriculum experience that will produce efficient and willing workers, equipped to secure employment and to advance in the industries and vocations that the country affords. The plan suggested would be less expensive than the experiments that have been tried out.

The schools must accept work as a factor in education. Parents can no longer adequately train their children in work as they have done in the past in agricultural occupations. Experience in manipulative skills is no longer a part of the education of many young people. It is believed by many educators that to transfer successfully from the adolescent to the adult citizen, the individual must have some work experience, and under our highly developed American civilization it would appear that the secondary schools must be responsible for the experience. The school can coöperate with industry in furnishing productive work experience, even without wages, to the trainee if it can convince its students that they have an obligation to fulfill to themselves, to the community in which they live, and to their country.

Because of educational developments outside of the formal school, the school system from the kindergarten through the university has been placed on the defensive; and perhaps it should be on the defensive, for there is evidence that it has failed in many ways to meet the needs of a changing society.

I do not believe that the narrow trade-school idea is the one that should be adopted in our secondary schools. It seems to me that a curriculum should be developed that would take into consideration students' aptitudes with reference to the type of work they are able to do; the schools should then

offer to the individual students through practice and intensive courses the opportunity to develop these aptitudes. Always mastery in each subject taught should be sought. It seems that fewer subjects should be offered, but each taught in its relationship to the individual as he fits into society. The secondary school, at the same time, should always keep in mind the social and economic needs of the community in which it is located, and, in addition, should bring into its range of activities the social and economic needs of the American way of life.

The only school that can give work experience is the community school, because group-like atmosphere can be best maintained where a coöperative situation prevails. In a community school the student gets the feeling of belonging to the group. A notable experiment of this type has been carried on in Holtville, Alabama, and we are attempting to do a similar thing at Mississippi State College. The student in the secondary school is idealistic, and he will not work at his best unless he believes that the work he is doing will contribute to the community in which he lives, and will be of benefit to his country.

It is not possible to give a blueprint as to just what projects ought to be developed in a good school, nor is it possible to be satisfied with projects already developed and utilize these over a period of years. Work experience, to be valuable, must be vital, socially indispensable, and individually beneficial. This means that each year the program must be re-examined, refined, readjusted, and adapted to the problems of the present year. This also means that the teachers must know the community and must be able to sense its needs, and, in addition, adapt the local school program to the national picture. Projects must not be selected that do not fit into the idea of the community school and the democratic way of life. A constant evaluation is necessary, and the work experiences that are to be provided should take into consideration how they affect the behavior of the students and how their personalities are developed. The objectives of the schools' student-work programs are (1) service to students, (2) service to the school, (3) service to the community and the nation.

The students are enabled, first, to secure normal wage-earning experience, which should possess positive educational values; second, to acquire better work traits and skills and gain experience related to their vocational and educational interests; and third, to put forth their best work efforts because of responsibility for performance and creation of desire to accomplish.

The school will profit because its normal activities are supplemented by work projects that will inspire honest, useful, conscientious service on the part of the students participating, when once their interest has been aroused. The results will be a better understanding of the use of the school as an instrument for increasing community and national welfare.

The community and the nation will benefit because the work projects



must fit into the community pattern of work and education. Such projects will develop in the worker an appreciation and understanding of democratic processes.

To follow the program suggested, it is necessary that the shackles of conventionalism be thrown off and new trails be blazed in the development of an efficient and effective secondary school system. I have always believed that the schools should lead and not follow, that they should help to shape the thoughts of the people rather than be behind the thinking and needs of the people. One of the reasons that the out-of-school educational work programs of the Civilian Conservation Corps and the National Youth Administration have become temporarily so popular in certain sections is that they are making an attempt to get away from the old-type formalized curriculum that once prevailed.

It has been said that a sound program of universal education is the strongest and most enduring common defense that the American people can have. The secondary school is a fundamental part of universal education as accepted by the United States of America. A valid procedure would be for the professional school people of America to direct their efforts toward the elimination of recognized internal weaknesses, evils, and dangers, which wither the system, and to substitute the needed adjustments and changes. We must be ready to make alterations in our program when such changes are necessary, and we must take a stern and uncompromising attitude toward all of those subversive influences which today are seeking to undermine the ideals and principles which every loyal American holds sacred. I believe that we are strong enough to meet all of our problems of the hour and accept our responsibilities as opportunities, and to work with all other recognized agencies that have for their purpose the perpetuation of American ideals and practices.

We must admit that the schools have not been perfect in their work. I have tried to show you, however, that change is upon us, and that to continue to serve, the schools as now organized must broaden and enrich their program of study to bring into the curriculum experiences during adolescence that will be worthwhile for the individual when he becomes an adult. It may be true that what is to endure must be slowly matured and gradually improved. However, our fault today is that we have not improved and changed as rapidly as we should have, and now we are faced with the stern reality that something must be done. On the other hand, any sudden attempt, however ambitious, to overthrow the existing order of things and set up a full-blown Utopia in its place is doomed from its very beginning to premature decay.

America is reaching maturity as a nation, and this maturity enables us to see more closely the relationship between work and education. It can be more easily understood now that work and education are component parts in the development of our youth. In this time of emergency everyone must

contribute his share to the national income and also his share of the labor. If, in the years that have gone by, more education concerning the conservation and development of human and natural resources had been given, we would not be the depleted nation that we are today. This type of education would have prevented the acute shortage of trained men for defense jobs so necessary today in the national emergency program. Therefore, as we survey the needs of an all-out program of defense, we realize that the resources which have been depleted must be restored, and that it is a duty of the school to do its part of the task of restoration by adopting a program that will bring about the desired results.

We should be willing to recognize the fact that our "failures" are not necessarily the students who drop out of schools before they have completed their period of training. The "failures" oftentimes are to be found in our educational procedures and practices. Because of these failures, outside agencies have come into existence to furnish a type of training that the schools themselves at least should have attempted to furnish. If we can develop a workable plan whereby this training can be kept within and under the supervision of the schools, we will have taken a great step forward in the matter of correcting the "failures" that now challenge the efficiency of the American public school system.

It is our duty and our privilege to serve the children of the South. Let us do it in such a way that we will make a contribution to every student who comes under our teaching or supervision, and in so doing keep alive our American democracy. We must learn to serve others rather than self, to the end that our country may emerge safely from this period of great peril, our people well-fed, well-clothed, prosperous, and still free men and women.

# What the Secondary School Can Learn from Work Camps\*

BY MORRIS R. MITCHELL  
*State Teachers College, Florence, Alabama*

Alternate expansion and crystalization have marked the history of all levels of our educational system. These are but contrasting aspects of the growth process. The genesis of each is in the fulfillment of the others.

As our secondary schools have grown in many ways, so they have accepted many pattern forms. Now one form is dislodged, now another. The parts move somewhat separately, out of time with one another, like the legs of a centipede. But the total motion has been undeniably forward.

Each change has its adherents, its opponents. These grow, wane. Purely intellectual education gave way reluctantly to emphasis on character building. Education of the emotions struggles now for recognition. The partial replacement of talking, and thinking, and reading, and writing with doing, and making, and planning, and sharing, and hoping, and serving is of our moment. How absurd now seem the first and almost purely verbal attempts to move into the character-forming period. We talked about honesty, thrift, courage, courtesy, loyalty, cheerfulness; taught mottoes, presented charts, heard verses, wrote themes. Gradually, though, we have become more realistic.

Often, we would admit, the schools in general have followed rather than preceded the alertness of out-of-school agencies which have met the unfulfilled educational needs as they became apparent. Boy scouts and girl scouts did not stop with the repetition of the assertion that scouts are trustworthy, loyal, helpful, friendly, courteous, kind, obedient, cheerful, thrifty, brave, clean, and reverent. They conducted programs of bodily activity exemplifying these proclaimed virtues. Likewise the YWCA and YMCA, the Camp Fire Girls, Boys' Clubs. On even a larger scale the present administration of the United States has found it critically necessary to establish CCC camps, NYA residence, and other projects. These programs reflect severely and critically on past performance of secondary schools. Rapidly though our schools had grown, they were not nearly meeting the vocational and avocational needs of millions of our youth.

Another characteristic of the forward motion of the secondary schools has been in the relative isolation of its purposes. The whole faculty psychology, so remote from the "gestalt" approach, has had its carry-over in the special responsibilities of special teachers, of special subjects. The physical educa-

---

\* An address delivered before the Commission on Secondary Schools of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, Louisville, Kentucky, December 2, 1941.



tion teacher has concerned himself mainly with muscles; the mathematics teacher, the mind. Morals have come especially on Sunday. Of course we need an integrated program in which there is balanced emphasis on all aspects of growth as they center about the dynamic and constantly expanding interest of the learner.

Work camps have more nearly approached the ideal learning situation than any other single institution. I refer of course to the better work camps, as those conducted by the American Friends Service Committee. For one finds in them every quality of sound education, and these qualities thoroughly integrated in the growth process. There is growth of social consciousness, an expanding and deepening concern for earth-round human welfare. There is related physical exertion and intellectual study. There is constant association of teacher and learner. There is balance in relationship of work and play. There is real concern and provision for health through reasonable hours of labor and through supervision by trained personnel. There are walks and conferences and lectures and seminars of discussion and of evaluation. There are records and readings, laughter and meditation. And all these things move through and within the individual to help him understand himself, his community, and the world, and to catch a sense of that essential harmony between man and nature for the want of which men kill and perish in the agony of this hour.

The first American work camp was conducted by the American Friends Service Committee. Wilmer and Mildred Young were the first directors. The same spirit of service that led them to direct a group of youth in installing a water main for a rehabilitation community project in Pennsylvania led them later to assist in the coöperative community venture, Delta Farms, in Mississippi, and at present to a project for the rehabilitation of tenant families and of physical resources near Abbeyville, South Carolina. Work camps have constantly been socially and individually purposeful. The camps organized by the Friends Service Committee have grown steadily in number and diversity of kind. It is a little hard to count or number them now because of their variations of type. But hundreds of youth are annually attracted to the work camps of this one organization. The youth come from all parts of the country and from very many religious backgrounds. Numerous other organizations have entered this field of service. The Progressive Education Association for years has held work camps. Work Camps for Democracy, and work camps organized by various church groups, have played their part in a growing movement.

Typically, work camps are located in areas of tension. The work of the campers is directed at once toward relieving this tension in at least some minor degree and studying the problem in all its aspects. The workers arise early, about five o'clock. In the course of a day they do their own work, cleaning, cooking, washing, and so forth. After an early breakfast there is

time for routine details and for group meditation. This phase is not common to all work camps and not required at any. Some work camps require only four or five hours of physical labor daily. The wiser practice seems to be that of expecting seven or eight hours of labor daily. Of course the volunteer cannot undertake so much at first. There is often mid-morning lunch as well as lunch at noon. The late afternoon is given to the study of the problems of the community and region. Naturally the relationship of the local problems to those of the world are not overlooked. Supper and then relaxation, recreation, several evenings a week lectures from, or discussions led by, prominent visitors who go from camp to camp to carry an understanding of their reaction to human affairs and to acquaint each work camp with the doings of the others.

There has been little or no support for such work camps from public funds. This was true in the early days of the secondary schools too. The cost has been defrayed by grants from foundations, by donations from individuals, by support from religious bodies, and by fees paid by the volunteers themselves. The actual cost including food, use of equipment, medical care, and leadership has been approximately fifty dollars per worker per month. This would be high compared with the monthly cost per pupil of our public secondary schools. But the services rendered would repay much of this expense through socially useful construction in such projects as have been undertaken: the clearing away of debris after cyclones, the building of dams to create community ponds, the construction of fish breeding ponds, the building and repairing of homes, the making and equipping of playgrounds in industrial areas, the building of dairies for coöperatives, the reconstruction of buildings which have suffered earthquake, the scientific care of community forests, the checking of soil erosion, and others. Then it must be remembered that this expense involves the total cost of living for food and shelter, medical attention, and excursions, as well as instruction and leadership.

In the forward motion of our secondary schools in equipping young America to play its part in a democratic nation and world we will do well to accept here and there into our program, as circumstances permit, more of the work camp program.

# The Junior College Organization in the University of Louisville\*

By J. J. OPPENHEIMER

*Dean, College of Liberal Arts, University of Louisville*

Colleges, like individuals, follow the principle of individual differences. Each college has its own character. This is due in part to the type of student body, faculty, curriculum, etc. The personality of a college may develop without deliberate planning or with a great deal of conscious effort. I believe that the college which I represent has been making a very conscious effort to develop itself in line with the type of students who come, their needs, the demands of the community, a modern conception of liberal education. On the other hand, there are many intangible factors which will influence the personality of the school. I can not go into these because they are mainly of a subjective character.

As you may know, the College of Liberal Arts of the University of Louisville is centered in a metropolitan community with a population of over 400,000. Ninety per cent of the students who attend this college live in the City of Louisville. A follow-up study of our graduates has revealed that about seventy-five per cent of the men and ninety per cent of the women who are graduated from the college remain in Louisville.

A study of student mortality covering five years revealed that sixty-one per cent of those who enter as freshmen do not enter the third year. Another fact which should be borne in mind is that the population of the college includes large numbers of students who come from economic groups that could not afford to send their sons or daughters to some out-of-town institution. A random sampling of the family income of last year's freshmen revealed the fact that the median income was around \$1,400.

Another fact should be added for background purposes. In 1928 the Board of Trustees of the University asked Dr. Frederick J. Kelly, now Specialist in Higher Education in the Office of Education in Washington, to make a survey and give recommendations in regard to the future of the Liberal Arts College. Among the recommendations were these: (1) that the college be divided in two divisions, the junior and senior; (2) that the faculty examine the curriculum offerings in light of the types of students who attend the college; (3) that the faculty examine the possibilities of developing broader courses which would provide for general education. The period between 1928 and 1933 was devoted to examination and to study of the

---

\* An address delivered before the Southern Association of Junior Colleges, Louisville, Kentucky, December 2, 1941.



college, its organization and general program. In April, 1933, the faculty adopted the general framework under which it is operating at the present time. Many changes have been made since 1933. An important thing to note is the fact that the college has kept the spirit of investigation and attempts to study its own work. To this end a full-time research secretary has been employed since 1931. But if the faculty did not have the attitude of self-examination and self-improvement for the college as an institution, no research secretary could do the job.

### *The General Features of the Louisville Program*

The general program which was outlined by the faculty in 1933 falls under the following headings: (1) the organization of the college, (2) articulation with the local high schools, (3) induction of freshmen, (4) a program of general education, (5) improvement of academic courses, (6) counselling program, (7) the general curriculum, (8) sophomore comprehensives, (9) internal study of the curriculum.

#### *1. The Organization of the College*

It was decided upon at that time that the college should be set up in two divisions, a junior college and a senior college. Incidentally, these terms are used frequently by the faculty and students. The administrative staff and faculty remained the same for both divisions. The departments that existed at that time were grouped into three divisions, Humanities, Science, and Social Science. Each division has a chairman who has higher rank than that of a departmental head. The dean recommends the appointment of each chairman, and they usually hold office for a two-year term. The divisions have certain legislative powers to set up general courses on the junior college level and in the senior year. They make recommendations to the faculty in regard to divisional requirements. They have supervision over comprehensive examinations. At one time there was some thought that we might be able to abolish departments and substitute divisional organizations, but that has not proved expedient in our institution. By setting up the junior college, the faculty recognized that many of the students who enter will remain only a year or two, and that only forty per cent of those who enter will continue into the senior college. The senior college is organized to assist students in a field of specialization or to prepare them for professional or graduate schools. Certain vocational objectives such as teaching, chemistry, public service, may be attained through the senior college curriculum. Because the faculty believes the major objective of the senior college is specialization and only secondarily general education, it has set up a selective admission plan for those who desire graduation. Our experience in setting up these two colleges within the framework of the Liberal Arts College has proved itself useful in our local situation.

## 2. *Articulation with the Local High Schools*

It is highly important that in a municipal college such as ours we work in very close coöperation with the local high schools. This is done by informal contacts with the faculty, by frequent visits to the high school, by conferences between University representatives and principals of the high schools and by special events to which graduating seniors are invited. To foster mutual understanding and respect, frequent conferences between the administrative staff of the public schools and University authorities are necessary.

## 3. *Induction of Freshmen*

The fact that we are a local institution and have the policy of close collaboration with the high schools has made the work of inducting freshmen into the college an easier task than might be found in many localities. During the past year we have invited to the college those seniors who were thinking of coming to the University to take tests before they had finished their high school work. We are hoping to extend this practice to include not only testing but also guidance. For the last five years the faculty has been attempting to set up a selective admission plan. This has come about by the fact that through the study of the success of our students we find no pattern of subjects taken in high school which would guarantee success in college. We, therefore, abolished specific subjects and accepted any student who had graduated from an accredited high school with this modification: that if the student was in the lower third of his graduating class he might be excluded if he did not make certain scores on his placement examinations in this college. This plan has worked fairly well, but we are still working on a program which will select with greater accuracy. The freshman week program covers the general topics that are found in most freshmen orientation programs. Through experience we have learned that it is important to do more counselling during freshman week and to assist the student in registering during that time rather than during the old type formal registration day. Too, we have learned to utilize student counsellors to assist the faculty counsellors.

## 4. *A Program of General Education*

As you will recall, one of Dr. Kelly's recommendations was that the faculty consider the problem of adapting courses to the kinds of students who attend this college. Taking this charge seriously, the faculty has been studying for some years the needs of this particular student body. Roughly, we have these groups of students: (1) those students who will remain in college a year or two, (2) those students who will be graduated and will then be married or go to work, (3) those students preparing for professions, including graduate schools, and (4) adults who wish to benefit by the offerings of the college

If one considers the needs of all of these groups, the needs will fall into two general categories: (1) the need for general education—a need for all groups, and (2) the need for specialized education.

This college believes sincerely that much of cultural education has been lost in the modern college and university. It believes it is high time that the American junior college and liberal arts college go back to the older concept of liberal education. Without expanding this concept, I shall state that in this college we believe that liberal education should tend to free men from their prejudices, from provincialisms, and from ignorance; that liberal education should enable young men and women to become better members of the important social institutions such as the state, the home, and the church; and that a liberal education should make one live more fully and with greater enjoyment to himself and to others. We of this faculty have determined to do our best to provide a general education program which will carry out these ideals. With many other critics we believe that the system of group requirements set up for the purpose of general culture by most American liberal arts and junior colleges makes an insignificant contribution to the cultural life of most college students. These introductory courses—first courses in a sequence of specialization—have not been organized for the purpose of broad functional understandings of the world in which the student lives, but have been organized to lead the student into an understanding and competency in an organized discipline of knowledge. Of course, if the student can live long enough and his interest does not give out, after years he may get a fragmentary view of himself and life about him. I should like to make this point: like any other instrument, courses are used for certain ends. They must be organized for definite ends. They cannot serve all purposes. Too many of us college teachers have a blind faith that our courses will “do all things to all men.” In our junior college curriculum, we have three distinct types of courses: general, academic (specialized), and student-interest elective. Here we are concerned with those devoted to general education. For that purpose we have developed these five courses: (1) English composition, (2) problems of modern society, (3) survey of the natural sciences, (4) survey of the humanities, (5) history of civilization. These carry six hours credit for a year’s work. A year of physical education is required. The total requirements of the junior college are sixty-one hours. You will note that one-half of a student’s program could be in general education.

A few points of view which are kept in mind in organizing these courses should be given. It is the belief of the faculty that students should understand the kind of world both physical and social in which they now live. The emphasis should be on contemporary culture, but not to the exclusion of the culture of the past which has significance today. It is highly important for the student to get a sense of historical perspective that our modern cul-



ture has been built up through laborious effort and sacrifices of the past. These courses have been gradually tending in the direction of satisfying the needs of the students. They started out with an emphasis on subject matter. These courses have been set up experimentally; that is, they have been subjected to rigid examination and have undergone numerous changes in the light of experience. The point of view which has been held in these courses is that they are terminal in character. That means that the teacher has this question in mind, "What would I want these students to learn if I knew that they were not continuing in their formal education beyond this course?" A brief account of each one of these courses may give a clearer picture of the program.

*English Composition.*—In this course teachers stress the ability to express oneself well in writing and in speech. Considerable time is spent on analysis of materials in current periodicals. The students are placed according to English ability in three levels. The treatment in these three sections is considerably different. Those in the lower sections are given the type of writing which is required in life outside of college—business letters, informal reports, brief speeches. A great deal of emphasis is placed on analysis of reading. One instructor has had considerable success in having students prepare brief histories of their neighborhoods and Louisville institutions. This project has aroused considerable interest in the city. At the present time the city has been covered about three or four times and an index of these short histories is being made. I think this idea has some importance because we are prone to de-emphasize the value of local history. Another instructor has considerable success in having students write autobiographies.

*Introduction to the Natural Sciences.*—This course is divided into two parts. One-half year is devoted to biological sciences and includes a great deal of material on health, personal hygiene, public health, and heredity. The other section is devoted to physical sciences. In the physical sciences considerable emphasis is put on chemical and physical principles which affect modern life. The instructors in these courses are attempting to give the students a better picture of the nature of the universe, the organization of science, the basic principles underlying modern science, and the importance of science to modern life. The course is quite different from many of the secondary school courses in general science, inasmuch as it deals with scientific generalizations and principles and not with applications of science to household equipment, inventions, and machinery. At the present time the instructors are emphasizing problems of thinking in science.

*Problems of Modern Society.*—This course deals with about twenty major problems which confront the conscientious citizen of today. These problems may be classified as political, economic, sociological, educational, and religious. Some of the important problems discussed are: (1) the role of the family in the modern world, (2) poverty and the maldistribution of family

income, (3) the family income, (4) the family as consumer, (5) the problem of housing, (6) the nation's health, (7) this business of crime, (8) the struggle between capital and labor, (9) unemployment and social security, (10) the role of the farmer in American life, (11) population movements in the world, (12) the problem of race differences, (13) the Negro in American life, (14) the causes of war and the conditions for peace, (15) what should America's policy be? (16) capitalism and socialism contrasted, (17) the communist and fascist ways of life, (18) democracy as a way of life, (19) public opinion and propaganda, (20) the political party machine, (21) modern education and its problems, (22) religion in world crisis, (23) planning and social progress, (24) looking to the future. There are three sections, one taught by a political scientist, another by an economist, and the third by a sociologist. These men teach all of the problems. They have had unusual success in planning this course. Special lectures, movies, and panel discussions have been used. This year they are using an advisory student committee.

*Survey of the Humanities.*—When sophomores and seniors have been asked to indicate the most cultural course to them, they have voted this course the one. This course is divided by the two semesters. The first semester is devoted to careful and analytical reading of books in contemporary European literature. A phase emphasized in teaching is that literature is a manifestation of the political, social, and economic life of a people. The students like this part of the course very much because it is a refreshing relief from the study of English and American literature. The second half of the course is composed of three parts: short courses in art, music, and philosophy. Art helps the student to look at a large variety of pictures, analyze them, and understand his own tastes. The student gets some notion of the major schools of art. He also realizes that the art objects, like literature, are the products of a culture. In music the student is introduced to various types and forms of music through records. The purpose of the course is to help him have a fuller appreciation for the better forms of music. The last section of the course is devoted to philosophy. This course is an attempt to describe philosophic method and apply it to two or three important contemporary problems, such as the problem of vocational choice, the nature of religious knowledge, the relationship of religion and science, and the relationship of the individual to the church. Instructors in the literature course come from the departments of English and German. The other instructors are from their respective departments.

*History of Civilization.*—The course in the history of civilization endeavors to give the student an understanding of how modern society has developed. The emphasis is on the cultural aspects of modern life. Less emphasis is placed on the political and constitutional facts of history. Movements which have affected modern life are emphasized. The teachers in this course also

are trying to assist the student in a better technique of thinking in the field of history.

Aside from English composition and physical education, the student is not required to take any of these courses. These courses cover much of the content of the sophomore examinations, but he may meet them by relying on his general background or by taking academic courses. During the freshman placement examinations the student is given the National Sophomore Test in General Culture. If he makes scores comparable to those of the average sophomore in the country at large, he is not required to pass the sophomore tests. About ten per cent of the freshmen pass this examination. In this event the counsellor advises the student to work out a schedule which does not include the courses in general education. In this one may see an attempt to get at the problem of proving competency in the area of general education. In other words, individual differences hold in respect to attaining a level in general education as well as in other developmental factors. These five courses, as I have tried to indicate, have for their major concern the general education of the student. If they assist the student in exploring his own interests in these fields of knowledge, well and good, but they are not treated as introductory courses to these fields. They are terminal.

#### 5. *Improvement of Academic Courses*

As I indicated before, the experience of this college leads us to believe that it is difficult if not impossible to attain the objectives of general education through the organization of introductory courses in specific departments. We believe that we have made real advances by setting up courses which have for their objectives general education and have reorganized our strictly academic courses so that they contribute to the specialized interest of the student. By following this line of demarcation the departments have strengthened first courses in departments materially. More material is covered, more emphasis is given to special techniques and to methods of thinking. Some of the departments have analyzed the whole sequence of offerings. For example, the department of biology has attempted to analyze what a biology major should know and should be able to do with his biological information and skills. Then each course has been re-examined in the light of the total picture of what a major should know.

#### 6. *Counselling Program*

Along with the reorganization of the course content, considerable emphasis has been placed on a personnel program. Each student is assigned to an adviser. The assignment is made on the basis of the student's vocational or educational interest. A cumulative record is made for each student. A great deal of information is secured from the high school, student himself, and his family. The placement scores are available to the counsellor.



This year all of the freshmen were given the Strong Vocational Interest Test. The counsellor is not restricted in his interviews, but two special periods during the semester are set aside for counselling purposes. If the student's problems reveal that he needs more specialized testing, the counsellor may call upon the research secretary or upon the professor and the department of psychology to give tests. We have the services of the college physician, and likewise we send most severe cases of mental maladjustment to the Louisville Mental Hygiene Clinic, which is under the supervision of the Department of Psychiatry of our School of Medicine. Case conferences are held in which the counsellor, some of the student's instructors, the deans, the college physician, and a psychiatrist are present. Parents are frequently called in for consultation. Because a very definite personnel point of view is held by our faculty, a great deal of interest is taken in the individual student. We feel it is highly necessary in the impersonal atmosphere of a city to do all that can be done to make the student feel at home on the campus and to feel he is among friends.

#### 7. *The General Curriculum*

Five years ago the faculty abolished the mechanical rules concerning probation and dropping students for poor scholarship. They set up a general policy that the Executive Committee, whose business it is to decide upon the academic status of the students, should take into account the abilities and circumstances of the student under consideration for poor scholarship. A student who proves himself to be willing to work and really is trying is not dropped from the college because of low grades. The faculty feels that as long as a weak student can profit by our offerings he may remain in college, but he will not be admitted to the senior college. On the other hand, the student who has the ability and who, because of lack of interest or excessive social life, makes poor grades is treated with a marked degree of severity. We have found a large number of students who had little chance of being admitted to the senior college. On the other hand, these people could profit by many of the offerings in the junior college. The Committee has used the term of putting a student in the "General Curriculum" when it is convinced that he can not succeed in the strictly academic curriculum. These students may take courses of general educational and vocational character. It is in this area that we think much more should be done. We have been constantly faced with the problem of helping students who will be compelled to drop out of school during the first or second year in college. Most of these students must drop out because of lack of financial resources. In this group there are many good students. On the other hand, there is another group of students who have little or no academic ability. As a public institution we feel that it is our duty to provide these people with vocational skills which they can utilize in bettering themselves economically.

We live in a city where there are thousands of businesses that need semi-professional skills. There is a constant demand from industries and commercial firms for students who have had some college education. With this in mind the University Senate approved a recommendation that the Division of Adult Education should extend its activities to include not only the adults who can attend night school classes, but that this division should concern itself with the inauguration of terminal semi-professional courses. I am sure when the University receives more finances that these courses will be set up. It will certainly assist in the problem of guidance.

### 8. *Sophomore Comprehensives*

Since 1933 we have used a selective admission plan for admission to the senior college. At the end of the sophomore year a student is required to pass the sophomore comprehensives. These examinations are made up of two batteries, first the National Sophomore Test in General Culture and second, local tests in general culture. These examinations cover about twelve hours of testing. They are scored by the research department; and if the student attains a satisfactory score and has met other requirements, he is admitted to the senior college unconditionally. The other requirements are sixty-one hours of work and a "C" standing. About one-fourth of the students who take the tests fail to pass. These tests have done a great deal to center the student's interest on these areas of general education. They have done a good deal to dispel the idea that once a course is passed it is over. The comprehensives give us some sort of idea of the effectiveness of learning as measured by these tests. The standing of the college in the national sophomore tests has done much to convince the faculty that the program has not been a failure. For the last four or five years the median of this college has been equivalent to the seventieth percentile on the national scores. This is significant because, whenever an experimental program is adopted by a faculty, there is always doubt about its effectiveness and much debate. The sophomore comprehensives have done much to allay the suspicion on the part of the "doubting Thomases." That the quality of the senior college student has been improved there is little doubt. We have evidences that these examinations and other provisions have really aided us in selecting students who will profit by the more specialized courses in the senior college, but that is another story.

### 9. *Internal Study of the Curriculum*

I think it is highly important to emphasize this point: that for over ten years the faculty of the college have been actively interested and at work in improving the program. Of course, at no time have all members of the faculty been equally interested or diligent in this activity, but a major group has always been at work. Sometimes the work has been under the super-

vision of committees, at other times departments have been at work, at still other times individual professors have reorganized courses. There has been a great amount of interdepartmental coöperation. There has been a tendency to break down departmental barriers. The curriculum development has done much to develop the educational leadership of some members of the faculty. As an example, four of our professors were teachers in four workshops last summer at the University of Chicago, University of Michigan, Peabody College, and the University of Minnesota. A full time research secretary assists the faculty in many ways, especially in testing and statistical work. This college has been one of the original members of the group which organized the Coöperative Study in General Education on the Junior College Level. As some of you may know, this project is under the sponsorship of the American Council on Education and is made up of twenty-two colleges of various types—liberal arts, state colleges, state teachers colleges, junior colleges, public, endowed, and denominational institutions. These colleges have been at work for the last three years improving general education in their respective institutions. The director of the study is Dr. Ralph Tyler of the University of Chicago. Time does not permit to tell more of this study, but the point I am trying to emphasize is that our experience in attempting to improve our program has been greatly aided by our membership in the Coöperative Study. It may be a suggestion to many junior colleges.

#### *Conclusion*

This has been an account of a ten-year program of faculty work. It does not include many other statements that might be made concerning the philosophy of the institution, or the difficulties we have encountered in the development up to date, nor does it tell of the future problems. It has been interesting and profitable for many of us who had the pleasure of working in it.



## Historical Section

This section continues the policy of the QUARTERLY in publishing as rapidly as possible sketches of member schools and colleges. Preference is given to schools whose membership dates back more than twenty years, because these schools—aside from the fact that their long membership identifies them for a longer period with Southern Association history—have usually been older schools with more of history to lose if an early record is not made. The QUARTERLY is glad, however, to have sketches of all member schools and to publish them as promptly as it can. In such articles *stress facts*, and take time to get them.—EDITOR.

## Historical Sketch of Roanoke College in Virginia

BY MILLER RITCHIE

*Alumni Secretary, Roanoke College*

On May 29, 30, 31 and June 1, Roanoke College will celebrate formally the centennial of its founding. In view of the war-time emergency, the elaborate program originally planned has been set aside in favor of a simpler pattern. But recognition of the centennial occasion, at least in spirit, is most appropriate, since a review of the first one hundred years of progress by the college reveals heroic struggle and achievement in the face of seemingly insurmountable difficulties. This record of the past serves to inspire present leaders of the College to meet with courage the problems of education during the present war and during the post-war period of readjustment that will follow.

The College was not founded by any particular organization. It did not spring from great endowment funds left in the interest of higher education by a generous philanthropist, and it was not a milestone in the slow progress of state-supported higher education in Virginia. It began as an ideal of education in the minds of two Lutheran preachers, David F. Bittle and C. C. Baughman.

In 1842 David Bittle was pastor of Mount Tabor Lutheran Church in Augusta County. As he went about his pastoral duties, he was impressed with the need of educational opportunities for young men, especially in preparing them for the ministry. Pastor Bittle was a man of action, as well as a dreamer, and he decided to put his ideal to the test, with the aid of another young preacher, C. C. Baughman, who had resigned his position at a pastorate in Jefferson, Maryland, because of an affliction of the throat.

First classes during 1842 were held in the Mount Tabor Lutheran parsonage. Approximately a dozen students attended classes the first session. Pastors Bittle and Baughman lost no time in bringing the work of their school to the attention of the Lutheran Synod of Virginia. In 1843 this body took action to establish a classical school, but subsequently instead of founding a new school adopted the one at Mount Tabor. Later the Synod of Western Virginia also gave its support. The annual report of the school was made to the Virginia Synod in 1844.

After the directors of the school had secured the support of the two Lutheran synods, they felt encouraged to attempt erection of suitable buildings. B. F. Hailman, a sympathetic landowner in the community, gave one acre of land and the lumber for the first building. This building was a structure of one story, soon to be followed by a second of two stories. An enrollment of seventeen students is recorded for the second year of operation, 1843.

The directors decided to apply for an act of incorporation by the Legislature of Virginia, passed January 30, 1845. In this act the name of the school was recorded as the "Virginia Collegiate Institute." The Reverend Mr. Bittle resigned his connection with the school in March, 1845, to accept a parish in Middletown, Maryland, and left the Reverend Mr. Baughman to assume full responsibility. Shortly after recognition of the school by the State Legislature, the matter of a more suitable location was considered. Salem, Virginia, was selected as such a place, being described as "beautiful for situation." A Newtown wagon, the dry-land schooner of that day, transported the principal and his belongings and those of the school to the new home in April, 1847.

No buildings had been prepared in advance for the transplanted school. Temporary quarters at different times during the first year in Salem were an unoccupied Baptist church located in what is now East Hill Cemetery in the eastern edge of the town, the Presbyterian Academy on the opposite (west) end of town, and an unidentified residence. But in the spring of 1847 four acres of land were purchased from W. C. Williams, and a contract for what is now the central part of the Administration Building was let to James C. Deyerle and Joseph Deyerle. In the summer of 1848 the new building was occupied. The same year the first catalog was published. In 1851 the west wing of the Administration Building was added. An incident emphasizing the connection of the institution with the Lutheran Church was the organization of the congregation of College Lutheran Church in the East Room of the Administration Building in 1852.

As the school grew stronger, expansion into a four-year college was thought desirable. A factor influencing this sentiment was the refusal of the Virginia Synod to give further financial support unless the Institute would make application for a college charter. Accordingly, an act introduced in the

Legislature of Virginia through the influence of John McCauley of Salem was passed on March 14, 1853, for the incorporation of Roanoke College.

David F. Bittle was called back to the institution to serve as first president and professor of intellectual and moral science. He was assisted by two other teachers: S. C. Wells, as professor of mathematics and natural philosophy; and Henri G. van Hoxar, as professor of ancient and modern languages and literature. C. C. Baughman, principal of the old Virginia Collegiate Institute, had resigned to become head of the Hagerstown Female Seminary. The plant of the newly chartered college was valued at \$10,000, on which there was a debt of \$8,000.

Since the chartering of the institution as a four-year college, there have been five presidents: Dr. D. F. Bittle, who was also the founder; Dr. Thomas W. Dosh, who was president only one year; Dr. Julius D. Dreher; Dr. John A. Morehead; and Dr. Charles J. Smith. With the exception of Dr. Dosh, each president has occupied the office for a considerable number of years. Accordingly, the personality of each president has made a distinctive impression on the development of the College.

Dr. Bittle, whose presidency continued from 1853 to 1876, is remembered not only as founder of the institution and as first president, but also as the very personification of the will of the institution to live and to grow. He was the great builder and provider during the early years. His vision set the course for the years ahead. In 1854 the cornerstone of the east wing of the Administration Building was laid. In 1857 Miller Hall was built. The student body grew steadily. In 1854 an enrollment of eighty students was reported; by 1861 this number had grown to one hundred and eighteen.

Then came the Civil War. Most colleges in the Confederacy closed their doors. Roanoke did not. Dr. Bittle adjusted his program to war-time service and carried on. College correspondence of the Civil War repeatedly refers to Roanoke as the only college in Virginia in continuous operation during that period. President Bittle secured from the Confederate Secretary of War permission for students attaining military age during a session to remain to its close. Students sixteen years and over were furnished arms and were required to participate in regular military drill. In 1862 young ladies were admitted; they continued to attend for two sessions. In June, 1864, Union forces under General David Hunter took possession of the College. One of the Union soldiers recognized Dr. Bittle as the same preacher whose sermon he had heard ten years before. Through this soldier's influence a guard was thrown around the campus to protect the College from plunder and fire.

During the War Dr. Bittle was steward as well as president of the College. He taught part of the day, and during the remainder of it scoured the countryside to buy and beg food to feed his students. The College had permission to slaughter its own beef, and it drove cattle in from the surrounding hills



of southwest Virginia. The records show that once considerable quantities of meat were stolen from the College "smoke house."

Having guided the College safely through the War, Dr. Bittle pressed forward with his building program. In 1867 Trout Hall was erected. The next project on Dr. Bittle's program of expansion was a library. But he attained it only as a memorial. The intrepid and energetic pioneer president died in the College faculty room while attending a church committee meeting on September 25, 1876.

Dr. Thomas W. Dosh was elected in 1877 to succeed Dr. Bittle, but he resigned the following year to enter the field of theological education. He continued on the Board of Trustees until his death in 1889. The trustees chose as third president the thirty-one-year-old Dr. Julius D. Dreher, whose presidency extended from 1878 to 1903. He had been on the staff as financial secretary since 1871, the year following his graduation. The great contribution of Dr. Dreher to the College was that of financial stability hitherto unknown. The South was still suffering the aftermath of war. Money was scarce. Financial collapse shadowed the struggling institution. Dr. Dreher traveled widely, increasing the student body and bringing to the support of the College many generous friends, especially in Philadelphia, Boston, and other Northern cities. The College still benefits from the estates of some of these donors. The principal physical addition to the College plant during the Dreher presidency was the erection of the Bittle Memorial Library in 1879, three years after the first president's death, and its annex in 1894. After a service of twenty-five years, Dr. Dreher resigned in 1903.

The fourth president was Dr. John A. Morehead, who served from 1903 to 1920. His administration was marked by expansion of the curriculum and the teaching staff. A number of new buildings were erected, including the Wells-Yonce dormitory for men, the Commons, and what is now the Laboratory Theater (originally the gymnasium). Dr. Morehead resigned in 1920 to become director of agencies of relief to Lutheran peoples in war-stricken Europe. He had begun work with the relief program in 1919 on leave-of-absence. For the session 1919-1920 Professor G. G. Peery, now head of the Department of Biology, was acting president of the College.

In 1920 Dr. Charles J. Smith, the present incumbent, was named president. The College has made great progress in a variety of ways during his administration. The endowment has been increased from \$166,000 to nearly \$700,000. The College has gained the whole-hearted support of its local community, including Salem and the city of Roanoke. The teaching and administrative staff has been doubled. The student body has grown from a total enrollment of 164 in June of 1920 to a total enrollment of 396 in the present session. The curriculum has been greatly enlarged. The College was elected to membership in the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools in 1927. Co-education as a definite policy was introduced

in 1930. Every building on the campus has undergone complete renovation. Three new buildings have been erected: Alumni Gymnasium, 1929; Lucas Chemistry Hall, 1941; and Smith Hall for Women, 1941. Two buildings have been converted for different uses: the present infirmary in 1941, formerly a faculty residence; and the present laboratory theater in 1934, formerly the College gymnasium.

Dr. Smith's presidency has continued from World War I to World War II. Under his leadership the College, at commencement time this session, will celebrate in simple and dignified ceremonies the centennial of its birth, believing in the continued importance of higher education for the preservation of freedom and democracy and re-consecrating itself to greater service during present travail of humanity.

## Hollins College

BY DOROTHY S. VICKERY  
*Member of Staff, Hollins College*

"Horizons of Freedom Today" was the theme of the centennial celebration held at Hollins College in May, 1942. In a world where horizons have shrunk, where liberty is a luxury, this title was symbolic of the fearless spirit of a liberal arts institution which, through a hundred years of history, has maintained its intellectual freedom, its non-sectarianism, its religious faith, and its devotion to the teaching of democratic principles. On other anniversaries wars, depressions, and social upheavals have prohibited a thoughtful management from marking the passage of time with appropriate ceremonies. In 1867, in its twenty-fifth year, the school was struggling under the impoverishment of the Reconstruction Period; in 1892, while meeting new demands for the education of women in a changing social order, the golden anniversary received little mention; in 1917, "due to the seriousness of the times," the seventy-fifth celebration was cancelled. Now in its hundredth year, the college challenges still more serious times by asserting itself as one of America's institutions upon whose enduring foundations the future of democracy rests.

In 1820 there was at this place which is now Hollins College a fashionable resort known as Botetourt Springs, built around a small sulphur spring which still flows on the campus. Its hotel and cottages furnished the buildings for the Valley Union Seminary established in 1842 under the sponsorship of the Valley Union Education Society, organized "for the sole object of conducting a seminary of learning for youth of both sexes, and all religious denominations." In 1844 a charter was granted the Society by the General Assembly of Virginia. A group of distinguished Virginians formed the first board of trustees of the seminary, many of them prominent in public life. Colonel George Plater Tayloe, son of John Tayloe, III, of Mt. Airy, was first president of the board, a position he held for nearly fifty years. On his wisdom and foresight, wealth and influence, the school often depended for its very existence.

In 1846 Charles Lewis Cocke, a young educator in Richmond, was called to take charge of a school struggling with inefficient management and meagre resources. As a boy of nineteen, he had written to a friend: "It is my purpose to devote my life to the higher education of women in the South." When the call came from the seminary, he recognized at once the opportunity for his chosen life work. At the age of twenty-six he was professor of mathematics and business manager of Richmond College. He resigned his two positions, cheerfully agreed to invest his savings of \$1,500 in the new venture, and with his wife and three small children left for the southwestern



frontier. When Mr. Cocke took charge of the school, he had seventeen pupils from the surrounding countryside; by the session of 1846-47, there were sixty-three pupils—thirty-six males and twenty-seven females; by 1851 applications were refused for lack of accommodations. It was regrettable that there was no money to build, but the situation presented to Mr. Cocke an opportunity to concentrate upon the education of young women. In 1852 he discontinued the boys' department and reported a registration of eighty-one girls in the "Female Seminary at Botetourt Springs"; by 1853-54 the number had increased to one hundred and fifty.

From the first Mr. Cocke urged higher standards, better facilities, better equipment—libraries, laboratories and all those things now universally recognized as necessary to education, but in earlier times so meagerly provided. During the ensuing years, he and members of his family were to work in every department of the school, and without compensation other than an actual living, in order that the institution might continue to meet the ever increasing demands for the education of women. This remarkable family, who controlled the school for a period of ninety years, first under a board of trustees and later as owners, placed upon Hollins a lasting influence, which today is responsible for the particular characteristics which distinguish this college from all others.

The curriculum of 1851-52 divided the seminary into preparatory and collegiate departments. For those who did not propose to enter the collegiate department, the preparatory course afforded "a sound, useful, and practical English education." The collegiate course included the following subjects: the Latin language and literature, the French language and literature, mathematics, the physical sciences, the moral sciences, and music. Each branch of study was distinct, and students were candidates for graduation in any or all of them, receiving diplomas at graduation. To be a "full graduate," a student must graduate in each branch and must also submit to the faculty an essay on some literary or scientific subject. In his report of July, 1857, to the trustees, Mr. Cocke said: "The plan and policy of the school . . . recognizes the principle that in the present state of our country young ladies require the same thorough and rigid mental training as that afforded to young men, and, accordingly, in the arrangement of the course of study, the appointment of professors, and the conferment of distinctions, this principle has been kept steadily in view."

In 1865 the school had three departments, the Normal, the Collegiate, and the Ornamental; for the "full graduate" diploma, there was the "full course of required study," and for the "graduate diploma," the "select course." In the 1880's another revision in the curriculum divided study into seven to nine courses or sub-departments. Students could graduate in one or more departments, receiving separate diplomas, or could work for the "classical diploma," the "scientific diploma," the "literary diploma," or the "full grad-

uate diploma." Candidates for the "full graduate diploma" had to graduate in six or more departments, among which they were obliged to include English language and literature, Latin, history, French or German, mental science, and mathematics or natural science. Between 1885 and 1900, only one hundred and twenty-five girls completed the hard course laid out for the "F.G."

The stimulation to literary effort created by the literary societies, Euzelian and Euepian, by Mr. Cocke's constant exhortations to "make literature," and by the teaching of Dr. William Taylor Thom, brought honor to the school in 1881 and 1882. Three members of the Shakespeare class won for Hollins the award offered by the New Shakespere Society of England for excellence in examinations upon "Hamlet" and "Macbeth." The great Oxford scholar, Frederick James Furnivall, commended the independence of thinking shown by Professor Thom's students.

The progress of the seminary in early days was impeded by lack of adequate accommodations and other facilities. While the school had gained many friends and a widening prestige, public interest in higher education for young women in the South had not reached a point where financial assistance was forthcoming. Nevertheless, Charles L. Cocke never ceased his efforts to advertise the quality of the school and its needs. He had his first success in securing the interest of Mr. and Mrs. John Hollins, of Lynchburg, and subsequently their donation of \$5,000 in the year 1855. The Seminary was rechartered as Hollins Institute, and in 1856 East dormitory was built. In 1860 Mrs. Hollins contributed an additional gift of \$10,000, and work was begun on Main building, which because of Civil War conditions was not completed until eight years later.

Life at the institute went on according to schedule all through the War and Reconstruction period, while throughout the South many schools were closing their doors. Years later in the report of the Commissioner of Education in Washington for 1890-91, Hollins Institute in 1861 was named "the best-known and probably the most effective seminary for girls in the South." All this was accomplished under the most difficult conditions, while the financing of the school fell almost entirely upon its officers. By the 1870's, however, the influence of the school had spread into neighboring states, from which it was drawing more than a third of its students. The increasing development and prosperity of the immediate community, and the extension of the Norfolk and Western railroad to Roanoke (formerly Big Lick), undoubtedly stimulated the growth of the school. The session of 1889-90 registered two hundred and nine students, and applications had to be declined.

It is difficult to trace the complicated financial arrangements by which the institution was kept above water in the early years. By his initial contract with the Board of Trustees in 1846, Mr. Cocke became principal and steward

of the seminary without stipulated salary. The agreement stated that he should pay his teachers' salaries and maintain himself and family out of tuition funds, the net revenue from the boarding department to go to the trustees. What remained of tuition funds after his teachers were paid belonged to Mr. Cocke, but this profit he continually spent for repairs and improvements of the plant; the revenue from the boarding department was never ample enough to provide for the constant need of increased facilities. By 1882 the Board owed Mr. Cocke about \$43,000. Repeated offers to deed the school to him in payment of the debt were refused; the disadvantages of a college under private ownership were too apparent to a man of his vision. However, on June 15, 1882, he agreed to take a lease on the property for a period of fifteen years. In ten years' time, under an agreement in the contract, many improvements in the property were made. A chapel was built and the old chapel in Main dormitory converted to other uses, an art and music hall was completed, the dining hall was added, West dormitory had acquired two wings, and two cottages for faculty were erected. In 1900 the question of how to perpetuate the institution had to be finally decided. It was necessary to reconstruct the financial basis of the school, settle the long pending issue with the trustees, and establish new officers. In failing health, President Cocke had the responsibility of providing both for the future of the school and of his family after his death. In 1900, when the total indebtedness of the Trustees amounted to more than \$100,000, he consented to the transfer of the property to himself and his family, and the board of trustees then went out of existence. The institute was incorporated in the names of six members of the Cocke family, and a Board of Governors was appointed from the family and members of the faculty.

Charles L. Cocke's philosophy of education for women emphasized the importance of mental discipline as a preparation for life, always accompanied by religious teaching and the inculcation of Christian ideals. He believed that teaching was the profession for which women were particularly adapted. Although he admitted that they might be capable of other work, he remained a conservative with regard to the place and conduct of women in society. In temperament and mental equipment, he might be said to have much in common with Dr. Thomas Arnold, the great headmaster of Rugby. His limitations, like Arnold's, were those of the era to which he belonged, but he, too, showed himself to be a man of vision beyond his times. He spoke and wrote eloquently in the best style of the day, and his writings contain opinions on many subjects, including religion, education, and the state of the nation. In Baptist church organizations, in good works among the Negroes, in charitable and educational enterprises, in community politics, his influence was felt as a leading spirit in his generation.

Mr. Cocke died May 4, 1901 at the age of eighty-one, having delivered in the previous year his fifty-second commencement address. In 1908, with the



assistance of contributions from students, faculty, alumnae, and friends, the Hollins library was erected as a memorial to him. The library completed the south quadrangle formed by the three dormitories built during his regime. The Susanna Memorial Infirmary, built in 1910, was named in honor of Mrs. Cocke, who died five years after her husband.

The dominant personalities at Hollins have, through the years, determined its philosophy of life and of education. Rather than by any rules or policies laid down at a given time, its character as a social institution has evolved from these personal influences. Such a force was Matty L. Cocke, who succeeded her father as president. Hers was a spiritual sovereignty, and at the peak of her career she became a symbol of the highest principles of academic and social conduct to which Hollins had aspired from the beginning. In circles where she was known, she was recognized not only as a sound educational leader, but as one who possessed the universal qualities attributed to a great lady.

At the beginning of the century, the new officers of Hollins were confronted with the growing demand on the part of the public and its benefactors for the development and improvement of education in the South. While new colleges were being established to meet these demands, Hollins was among the older institutions required to overhaul their properties, and make necessary changes in organization, curriculum, and personnel. Among the administrative officers, Marion Estes Cocke, secretary and treasurer, played an important part in reorganizing the curriculum and in redefining the entrance requirements to conform with the new standards. To this end, he was in constant attendance at meetings of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools.

When Miss Cocke took office as president, she was called upon almost immediately to agree to changes in the structure of the curriculum. With the opening of the first session under the new management, a committee was appointed to work out requirements for an A.B. degree to take the place of the old "full diploma." The first A.B. degrees were awarded in 1903. During the first ten years (1903-1912), one hundred and six A.B. degrees were awarded, an average of 10.6 per year. Entrance requirements in terms of Carnegie units were first published in the catalogue of 1910-11. At this time the distinction between sub-collegiate and collegiate work was being increasingly emphasized. Subsequently, in 1919, the preparatory department was abolished.

In 1911 Hollins Institute became Hollins College, and the charter was so amended by the State Corporation Commission. In the same year the Virginia State Board of Education included Hollins in the list of accredited colleges for Virginia. In 1916 Columbia University announced that Hollins students who had received the A.B. degree in the year 1913 and there-

after would be admitted to full graduate standing; other graduate schools soon followed suit.

In 1918-19 the Bachelor of Music degree was introduced, with a course of study following general standards set by other colleges with similar departments. Entrance requirements were based on the same fifteen units as for the A.B. course. Five members of the music faculty, under the director, Erich Rath, combined the teaching of theoretical courses with applied courses in piano, organ, voice, and violin. Required A.B. courses, included in the music degree, were English, modern languages, and history of art, and, in addition, seven hours of electives taken during the sophomore, junior, and senior years. A normal course, open also to A.B. students, was offered to meet the demand for trained teachers of public school music.

In 1924 a deanship was added to the offices of administration, and Miss Mary Williamson, professor of philosophy and psychology, was appointed to the office. Her understanding of youthful interests, her practical judgment, and her intellectual standards were of inestimable value through ten difficult years in the development of the College. Under her guidance the Student Government Association attained its efficient and dignified status on the campus. Two years later, the duties of the office were divided between Mr. Cocke, as dean of instruction, and Miss Williamson, as dean of students. In 1934, the office was again placed under one head.

The years 1924 and 1925 were notable for important building operations which raised the value of the property to one and a quarter million dollars. A little theatre with complete stage equipment provided for laboratory courses in dramatic art, and a modern gymnasium with swimming pool increased the scope of physical education and recreation. A fire in 1925 partially destroyed the science hall, built in 1914, but it was immediately rebuilt and equipped with new apparatus. In 1925 the College was further enriched by the gift of a music hall by Theodore Presser, professor at Hollins from 1880 to 1883. It was the first of the Presser Halls to be erected, tangible evidence of the philanthropist's friendship and admiration for Charles Lewis Cocke.

Through the Student Government Association students began to have a voice in the administration of their college. Beside regulating their own social standards and code of honor, they asked for certain changes in the system of grading, for a voice in the selection of visiting lecturers and ministers, and for improvements in buildings. Pressure from the student body resulted in the building of the little theatre and gymnasium, toward the cost of which they raised a pledged amount of \$45,000. Student vision and initiative were exhibited again in 1929, when national sororities, on the campus for over twenty-five years, were abolished. The action came as the result of a petition signed by seventy sorority members, who felt that the fraternity system promoted an undemocratic standard in a small college.

So far Hollins had traveled without endowment, but for some time the Cocke family, alumnae, faculty, and students had come to realize that the maintenance of high scholastic standards—and possibly the future of Hollins as a four-year college—were threatened by the condition of private ownership. Standardizing agencies could not consider Hollins for membership until the College had been placed again upon a public foundation, *i. e.*, under a board of trustees, and had met minimum endowment requirements. Regional and national recognition was urgently needed in order that the Hollins degree might be accepted at its full value wherever presented, and that the College might assume its rightful place among American institutions of its type.

In 1924 Vice President Lucian H. Cocke, in the name of the Board of Governors, proposed the conveyance of the Hollins property to a self-perpetuating board of trustees. The Board of Governors announced their willingness to transfer the College and its property, valued conservatively at \$1,250,000, for a sum of \$50,000 to be paid in ten annual installments of \$5,000 each, and for some pensions never exceeding \$9,000 annually, to be divided upon their retirement among certain individuals who had spent their lives in the service of the College.

The new board of trustees, including three alumnae members, was chartered as Hollins College Corporation on December 30, 1926, and held its initial meeting in January, 1927. The sum of \$500,000 for endowment and \$150,000 for working capital and improvements were stipulated as the minimum requirements for the public foundation, and the new corporation was committed to providing itself with these funds. A general committee of prominent citizens of the South was formed for the promotion of the campaign, largely through the active leadership of D. D. Hull, Jr., of Roanoke, Chairman of the Executive Committee and President of the Board of Trustees. The alumnae phase of the general campaign was held in thirty districts, with more than two hundred and fifty alumnae engaged in active work; to them goes much credit for the results accomplished. Members of the board of trustees and of the Cocke family spent themselves in strenuous efforts for the success of the endowment campaign, but the greatest responsibility for leadership and creative work was assumed by the late Joseph A. Turner, then business manager of the College. As a confirmed idealist, he had only one theme—the greater Hollins—and consumed by this purpose, he devoted to it all his versatile powers.

At the beginning of the campaign it had been anticipated that substantial gifts could be obtained from various educational foundations and from wealthy friends of education. It was hoped that the General Education Board would contribute to the Hollins fund, as it had given to other college endowments; but during the long, uncertain delay in the transfer of the College, this Board had adopted a new policy. It had determined to devote



henceforth a large part of its resources to special projects rather than to general endowments. The Carnegie Corporation responded generously in the form of a gift of \$10,000 for the purchase of books for the college library, but made no gift to the endowment. Contributions from individual donors were in no case large enough to make up the deficiency in foundation gifts. The depression era retarded the payment of pledges, and for several years, the future security of Hollins hung in the balance.

In 1932, the college authorities decided to take the necessary steps toward obtaining recognition for the College by the accrediting agencies. The first step had to be the transfer from private ownership back to a public basis; it was concluded that this should be done even before the full endowment was raised. To this end, the stockholders of Hollins College adopted a resolution to modify the terms of the original proposition to the Board of Trustees, and expressed themselves as willing to convey the property at the existing endowment figure, believing that the desired objects of the transfer would be more speedily obtained by such action.

It was a dramatic moment in the history of Hollins College, when on August 1, 1932, President Matty L. Cocke delivered to the Board of Trustees of Hollins College Corporation a legal document, the deed to Hollins College. As a result of this act, Hollins became a publicly owned college, governed by a self-perpetuating board of trustees. The members of the Cocke family, after a tenure of thirty-two years, relinquished their property; and thus was realized the dream of the founder, Charles Lewis Cocke, who in 1900 had reluctantly accepted the College from the public board of that time.

At the December, 1932, meeting of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, Hollins College was granted unconditional membership. In October, 1934, the Association of American Universities voted to include Hollins in its approved list, and in June, 1935, the American Association of University Women admitted Hollins to the list of women's colleges whose graduates are eligible for national membership in the Association. A.B. graduates, beginning with the year 1903, became eligible for full membership. In 1934 the decision was made to convert the School of Music into a Department of Music under the A.B. degree, and in the same year Hollins was one of the first liberal arts colleges to have its music department accredited by the National Association of Schools of Music.

In the year following the beginning of operations by Hollins College Corporation, the Board of Trustees was called upon to select a new president. In 1933 Miss Matty L. Cocke, president of the College since 1901, asked to be allowed to retire. At the board meeting of July 15, 1933, Dr. Bessie Carter Randolph was elected the third president of Hollins. She was then an alumna member of the Hollins Board of Trustees, and was professor of political science at Florida State College for Women. At the same meeting, Miss Cocke was elected President Emeritus. She remained at her home on

the campus, which until her death in 1938 continued to be a center of warm hospitality and wise counsel for the whole community.

It was fortunate that the College found among its alumnae an administrator who was suited to the presidency. It was thought fitting that a Virginia woman should be chosen. Although students came from all parts of the country, it was the desire of the board, and of the Cocke family, to preserve at Hollins the best elements of a distinctly Southern atmosphere. Miss Randolph had these qualifications. To her acquaintance and sympathy with the principles and standards for which Hollins had stood through ninety years, she could add breadth of experience and professional training. Few women in the South were better known to educators than Miss Randolph, and few possessed her knowledge of Southern educational conditions. Nor had she limited her activities to purely academic affairs; in every community in which she had lived, her good citizenship had made itself felt. She began her administration in a period of uncertainty in America, but through her careful educational and financial judgment, the College found itself in a secure position.

In her first report to the board of trustees of July, 1934, President Randolph analyzed the new curriculum to go into effect the following September. The most important change was the introduction of the divisional system, which is arranged today as follows: Division I, the Humanities—classical languages, English, modern languages, and philosophy and religion; Division II, the Social Sciences—economics and sociology, history and political science, and education; Division III, Natural Sciences and Mathematics—biology, physical science and mathematics, and psychology; Division IV, the Fine Arts—art, music, and dramatic art and speech; and hygiene and physical education, a department which remains unaffiliated.

In 1939 the Carnegie Corporation made a gift of \$35,000 to the unrestricted endowment fund of the College. This was the fourth gift from the Corporation, the Carnegie art and music teaching sets having been received several years earlier. By 1942, including continued payments of many early pledges, the unrestricted endowment stood at \$430,000. The improvement fund of \$165,000 had long ago been fulfilled by plant additions and improvements.

The students of 1937-38 decided to start a fund for the erection of a new dormitory to be named "Turner Hall" in honor of the late Joseph A. Turner and his sister, the late Leila Turner Rath, teacher of German. With renewed enthusiasm, the efforts of the campus endowment committee were transferred to a campaign for funds for the new buildings. In succeeding years student projects have been directed toward this end. In 1938 the Hollins Alumnae Association launched a campaign for the Alumnae Centennial Fund to be presented as a birthday gift to the College. This year

both student and alumnae gifts have been converted by the College into War Bonds.

During the past two years a long-time plan for campus improvement and development has been instituted by the administration, and working designs, drawn by the college architect, are being carefully studied for the future. The increasing requirements of modern education and the advantages of a larger student body (Hollins has a capacity of about 330 students) now present pressing needs for the Hollins of the second century. A new library, new dormitories, art building, administration building, campus church, and other additions are included in the comprehensive plan. It is anticipated that after the War the first unit in the building program to be erected will be Turner Hall, a dormitory which will accommodate a gradually increased student body, which it is hoped can be limited to a maximum of 500 students.

This, briefly, is the blue print for the material development of Hollins College at the beginning of its second century. In the community of American colleges and universities, Hollins will be called upon to assume new responsibilities in the post-war world, and to produce graduates whose broad liberal arts training should equip them for leadership. Imbued with the same spirit which carried it forward through the past hundred years, the College looks forward the realization of a plan that will advance its academic program and increase its effectiveness.



# Historical Sketch of Tulane University of Louisiana

BY GEORGE E. SIMMONS

*Assistant Dean, College of Arts and Sciences, Tulane University*

Although Tulane University observed its centennial in the session 1934-35, only the School of Medicine was passing its 100th anniversary at that time. The Medical College of Louisiana, forerunner of the University, was organized in September, 1834, and chartered April 2, 1835. In March, 1836, it issued degrees which were the first in medicine or science ever conferred in Louisiana or the Southwest.

Establishment of a university in New Orleans was ordained in the State Constitution of 1845. It was to be composed of four faculties, including one of letters and one of natural sciences. The Medical College of Louisiana as then organized was to constitute the faculty of medicine. However, the constitution also provided that the Legislature "shall be under no obligation to contribute to the establishment or support of said University by appropriations."

The beginning of the present College of Arts and Sciences might properly be dated June 1, 1847, for at that time the Administrators of the University appointed a committee "to report on the expediency of organizing the department of letters and natural sciences, and on the means that can be commanded to that effect." Because no funds for this division had been provided by the Legislature, it was suggested that subscriptions for the purpose should be sought privately. Only two donations, \$500 each from Glendy Burke and Judah Touro of New Orleans, were obtained; but in 1848 a small appropriation was granted by the State, and an academic building was erected.

The new Academic Department conferred its first diplomas in 1857, when three students received degrees, one the Bachelor of Arts and two the Bachelor of Science. Incidentally, the first successful candidate for the A.B. degree was Arsene Breaux, later Chief Justice of the Louisiana Supreme Court and a benefactor of the University. The Breaux Scholarships, now offered by the University, were established through a bequest from him.

Because of the War Between the States, the department closed in 1861 and was not reopened until November 4, 1878. It was then officially named the "Academical Department." Although it included a high school, that department was the direct forerunner of the present College of Arts and Sciences.

Financial support of the department was granted in the State Constitution of 1879, but this authorized an appropriation of only \$10,000 a year for the University's three departments, the law, the medical, and the academical.

This support was continued on that basis until 1884, when the Legislature was relieved of the obligation by a contract with the Administrators of the Tulane Educational Fund.

The more extensive development of the University began with benefactions received in the decade when the institution acquired its present name. In 1882, Mr. Paul Tulane donated his New Orleans property for the higher education of "the white young persons in the city." The transfer was made to trustees who were incorporated under the title of "The Administrators of the Tulane Educational Fund." Mr. Tulane's first donation of real estate was valued at about \$363,000, and his subsequent donations made the total which he gave approximately \$1,050,000. He had expressed the intention to add largely to that sum, but, as he died intestate, that intention was never carried out.

Complete and perpetual control of the University of Louisiana was transferred to the Administrators by the Legislature in 1884. The same legislative act changed the institution's name to "The Tulane University of Louisiana." The act was ratified at a general election in 1888. In the session 1884-85, the "Academical Department" was named "Tulane College," and the high school which had been operated in that department was established as a separate division of the University.

At that time, instruction in engineering was offered in the Mechanical Course in the College, and electrical engineering was added in 1888. Expansion of the courses in engineering led, in 1894-95, to establishment of a "College of Technology," and to the renaming of Tulane College as the "College of Arts and Sciences." Separate administration of the two colleges continued until 1900-01, when they were merged as the Academic Colleges. However, they were separated again in 1911, and have operated since then as the College of Engineering and the College of Arts and Sciences. Both colleges were moved in October, 1894, from their old location in downtown New Orleans to the present campus on St. Charles Avenue, opposite Audubon Park.

The College of Arts and Sciences now offers three four-year programs of undergraduate studies and two programs, of three years each, in combination with professional studies. These programs are literary, scientific, physical education, scientific-medical, and literary-law. The first three lead, respectively, to the degrees of Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Science, and Bachelor of Education in Physical Education. Pre-professional instruction in medicine and law is provided by the scientific-medical and literary-law programs. Students who complete three years in the latter two programs may, if they enroll at Tulane in the School of Medicine or the College of Law, apply their first year of professional courses as their senior year in the College of Arts and Sciences.

Within the last decade, notable changes in the curricula of the College

have been made. For the most part, these have tended to make the programs of study more flexible without altering fundamentally the requirements for a degree. The classical course, offered until 1937, has been merged with the literary program. The library-law program was first designated as such in 1938, although pre-legal courses had been offered previously.

Ordinarily, one-third or more of the freshman class in the College is composed of students in the scientific-medical program. A close connection between the medical and liberal arts divisions has been maintained, and students have been granted automatic admission to the School of Medicine upon completion of the scientific-medical program. However, this arrangement was abolished, beginning with the class entering the College in 1941-42. It seems probable that the foregoing change will increase the percentage of students who follow a four-year program in the College. The student-body, which totaled 825 in the first semester of 1941-42, is composed almost entirely of male students. Women students are admitted only in the Journalism department and, occasionally, in courses which are not offered by H. Sophie Newcomb College, women's division of the University.



# The H. Sophie Newcomb Memorial College of Tulane University of Louisiana

BY STUART G. NOBLE

*W. R. Irby Professor of Education, H. Sophie Newcomb College*

The H. Sophie Newcomb Memorial College was founded in 1886. In that year Mrs. Josephine Louise Newcomb, earlier a resident of New Orleans but then living in New York, entrusted to the Administrators of the Tulane Educational Fund a donation of \$100,000 for the purpose of establishing a college for women as a memorial to her daughter, Harriott Sophie Newcomb. The new institution was to be coördinated with the several colleges of Tulane University and was to furnish for women the advantages of higher education then available only for men in this community. The substantial development of Newcomb College was made possible by further donations during Mrs. Newcomb's lifetime amounting to over half a million dollars, and by the residue of her estate, amounting to about \$2,700,000, bequeathed to the College on her death in 1901. Careful management of this endowment has provided a modest, and for the most part adequate, equipment for a college of some seven hundred students and has assured its material advancement.

The idea of the coördinate college for women, in this instance, was an original contribution. Fifty years ago co-education was not generally recognized in conservative colleges. Sentiment for the higher education of women, however, was rising, and the administrative expedient here introduced seemed to offer the solution of a problem that was beginning to vex the universities of the East. Columbia sent a committee to Tulane to study the new plan of organization before employing it for the establishment of Barnard College. Harvard followed Columbia's lead in the founding of Radcliffe as a coördinate college. Other institutions later applied this principle in providing for the higher education of women.

Although it was contemplated that Newcomb should be of collegiate rank, conditions did not in the beginning make such an establishment possible. There were in New Orleans at that time a girls' high school and several private academies, but none of these maintained standards high enough to meet the prevailing college entrance requirements. Local sentiment here did not strongly favor the higher education of women nor was sentiment elsewhere much farther advanced. In the East, Vassar, Wellesley, Smith, and Bryn Mawr had but recently been established. Hence, it is not surprising that the new institution at its opening was hardly more than a "female" academy of the type that then flourished widely in many parts of the country.

There were the usual courses in music, literature, and art to provide the young lady's accomplishments. To these were added the sterner studies, mathematics and the natural sciences, which had already found a place in the better academies of the period. Spanish was offered at the outset, but French, German, and the more difficult Latin were later provided for. The aspirations of President Brandt V. B. Dixon (who had been brought from St. Louis to launch the College) were high and his courage was resolute. He shortly founded his own preparatory school and struggled hard to "raise the grade" of the College, but it was not until 1908 that Newcomb attained the A-Grade rank on the list of the United States Commissioner of Education.

As Mrs. Newcomb's munificence continued and as social and economic conditions in New Orleans improved, the College grew and gradually came to embody President Dixon's conception of an institution for the higher education of women. After a few years it was moved from its first location on Delord and Camp streets to more attractive and commodious quarters on Washington Avenue. Here provisions were made for boarding students. Existing departments were improved and new ones were added. The art department, in particular, flourished under the able direction of Ellsworth Woodward and in time came to enjoy more than local celebrity. Following the trend of women's education elsewhere physical education, home economics, and courses for the training of teachers were introduced.

From the beginning the status of Newcomb was that of a college in Tulane University. President Dixon held a professorship in the College of Arts and Sciences and the Woodward brothers contributed courses in art to this College. But, as Newcomb was located in a different part of the city from the other colleges, as its funds were kept separate from other University funds, and as the problems of administration were, generally speaking, quite different, the College came to regard itself as practically a distinct institution. The advantages of a closer affiliation with the parent University, however, became more apparent with the advancing years.

When, after some years of litigation, Newcomb came into possession of its generous legacy, the way was cleared for the erection of the present plant adjoining the Tulane campus. This was ready for occupancy in 1918 and the first buildings to be opened were the Administration Building, the Josephine Louise House for boarding students, and the Art Building. In the course of the next decade, a physical education building, Doris Hall, Warren Newcomb House, and Dixon Hall were added in the order named. All of these with the exception of Doris Hall, which was the gift of an anonymous donor, and Dixon Hall, which was built from funds raised by the alumnae, were built from the proceeds of the Newcomb inheritance.

President Dixon retired as the chief administrative officer at the end of the session 1918-1919. By the 1920's, the institution was attaining the

maturity of a substantial college and was charting its course after the well-known pattern of the women's colleges in the East. Under the direction of Dean Pierce Butler, who succeeded Dr. Dixon, the College eagerly met the most exacting requirements of the national accrediting agencies. Certain courses, such as home economics in which proper standards could not be maintained, were abandoned. The faculty was improved by the employment of professors with advanced degrees. Honors courses, comprehensive examinations in the major subjects, and merit points, then among the newer practices of the more progressive institutions, were introduced.

The average enrollment now rose above 600 and, in certain years, it passed the 700 mark. The dormitories, built to accommodate only about 250 students, were taxed to capacity, and attendance of out-of-town students was accordingly limited to the upper two-thirds of the high school graduating classes. All students whose records did not promise scholastic success were eliminated after a fair trial.

The ideals of thorough scholarship and liberal education replaced those of the old-time girls' finishing school. Students came to regard themselves as responsible young women capable of managing their own affairs with safety and dignity. The machinery for student self-government had been organized as early as 1909. Altogether, Dean Butler's administration extending from 1919 to 1938 was one of substantial growth.

It seems probable that Dean Frederick Hard's administration, which began in 1938, will be distinguished by closer collaboration of Newcomb with the other colleges of the University. External conditions will probably facilitate the trend in this direction. Already the student bodies of the several colleges are being brought together in a common student activities building conveniently located for all. The joint use of Dixon Hall, the McAlister Auditorium, and the Howard-Tilton Library will doubtless make for the unification of educational effort within the University.

For some years the Art School and the Music School offered courses leading to specific degrees in the respective departments—degrees which tended to stress skill and technique rather than academic qualifications. Recently these courses have been placed on practically the same basis as that of the bachelor of arts degree, except that the Art School now offers a five-year course leading to the degree of bachelor of fine arts.

Newcomb attained the A-Grade status earlier than most of the Southern colleges for women. For this reason, it was able early to extend its clientele to the neighboring Gulf states. For more than twenty years, notwithstanding the recognition by the accrediting agencies of numerous competing institutions in this area, it has been able to fill its dormitories with out-of-town students. In fact, it has been able to establish and maintain high standards for the selection of this class of students. The range of its clientele has now been extended to more remote states of the North and West.



## Editorial Notes

### Keep Standards During the Emergency

The Atlanta Resolutions of February 6-7, reproduced in full as the first article in this issue, go squarely on record in favor of maintaining standards during the world crisis. The colleges pledge their utmost support to the government in its hour of need. They contribute cheerfully from their manpower and their resources. But the motto is "Thumbs up; no shoddy work; no using the emergency as an excuse to 'slack'." The resolutions assume it is just as dishonest to admit an unprepared student when the world is on fire as when it isn't and just as inexcusable to give him a "cheap" degree now as ever before. We agree. Youth are more serious during the emergency, even as we who are older; and many youth are willing to work twelve months instead of nine, in order to advance more rapidly. They are also willing to give up some of their outside activities that now seem so pitifully unimportant. Well and good. Encourage them and let them complete their work somewhat more rapidly; but give them value received, if you believe you have ever had any value to give. Don't award them a degree without *bona fide* guiding them through the actual growth that the degree has come to represent.

### The American Four-Year College: "A Place to Grow Up In"

Legitimate acceleration as contemplated by the Atlanta Resolutions is possible; but even as we accelerate, we wish to remember that the American four-year college has a good many values that cannot be measured in terms of semester hours of credit, speed of assimilating facts, and facility in standing examinations.

Professor Marjorie Hope Nicolson of Columbia University quotes William Allan Neilson, when he was president of Smith College, as laying down the dictum to his students, "College is a place to grow up in." This is the best summary we have heard of some of the values in the American four-year college that are not included in ordinary transcripts and examinations. It is quite possible that the sad times through which we are passing speed up the growing of college youth: if so, there is a legitimate acceleration that is possible. Without some speeding, however, of the actual growing up, acceleration becomes a mockery.

The four-year college is an American institution. It is different from the English college from which it derives and still more different from the continental college. College faculties have cause to marvel year after year at the manner in which somewhere between the freshman and junior and senior

years the college lad matures not only in ideas but in his ability to express himself on examinations and in speech. The four years we have allowed for this process of maturing, with a pretty general pattern of studies, lectures, and extracurricular activities, plus three months each summer for maturing under the social conditions of home or of a job, have rapidly become the ambition of the typical American family even in moderate circumstances. More mature students—matured perhaps because of the necessity of going to work earlier, or because they have quit school for a time and then returned—have dropped the three months of vacation and utilized recently developed summer quarters to accelerate graduation within a three-year period. For these students also, in so far as their greater maturity of mind and purpose made it possible, acceleration is not to be condemned.

On the other hand, there grew up a generation or so ago correspondence schools offering opportunities to thousands who did not feel themselves able to go to college. These schools have been condemned for not giving value received to thousands of weakly ambitious folk who were over-stimulated to enroll in courses and pay fees only to find out that they were unable or unwilling to continue the courses for which they had paid. But after stating this frequently stated criticism against the correspondence schools, any fair-minded person is compelled to admit that thousands of earnest men and women have received full value from correspondence courses. Many of these courses have been as well organized as some of the best courses offered in colleges and universities. The students who pursued them to completion developed habits of study and initiative far beyond the habits of study and initiative of the average student resident in college. Some students have completed by correspondence courses of study based upon the courses of study leading to the A.B. or B.S. degree in a standard college. But when they have received a correspondence degree of Bachelor of Arts, there has been a general lifting of eyebrows. Why? Not because of question as to the integrity of examinations taken *in absentia*, for that is a routine matter that might be safeguarded. Not because some of these holders of correspondence A.B. degrees might not be entirely capable of standing examination on equal terms with many A.B. graduates of standard college. I suspect that some of them could. The real reason is the fact that when we consider an A.B. degree from a correspondence school, we think of it as representing the shell without the substance. We think of it as representing courses taken and examinations passed without the growing up that is the heart of the American college experience.

The correspondence schools hurt themselves by taking established degrees and thereby claiming before the American people that they were giving the same values the four-year college or professional school gave. In their thinking only of the learning of facts from books they may have been honest in doing so. It is quite possible that some of them that offered the Bachelor's

degree by correspondence honestly had a narrow view of college education. On the other hand, they threw themselves open to the suspicion of trying to obtain "trade" by claiming to give something they were simply not equipped to give. They could have established a degree of their own, stating specifically what values this degree had that were included in the values of the A.B. or B.S. and in the long run have laid a foundation for respect that is even now frequently denied them because of the falsity of their original position.

Why should any reputable American college or university repeat this initial blunder made by some of the correspondence schools? Why should it think or believe that it can make thinking American citizens believe that it can, by giving an examination or a series of examinations, give the *same experience* as four years' growth in college? The attempt to offer Bachelor's degrees based on two years or less of college residence solely to students who will pass certain examinations probably will and should cause the public to feel that any institution doing so is really offering a "short-cut" that is not of proved value. The institution puts itself in the position of saying to ambitious youth: "Here is a degree that has come to represent a normal course of four years calling for so much expenditure of time and effort. This degree has become a standard form of educational currency. We now propose to devalue it by offering you the same degree for half the expenditure of time and effort. We could simply say that we believe the last two years unnecessary and that we would admit you to our professional and graduate schools upon examination at the end of two years; also that we would give you a new degree of our creation that we propose to make as valuable as any Bachelor's degree now given. But if we were to be thus frank and modest, we might not be able to persuade you to come to us, because you have been taught to think in terms of Bachelor's degrees. We therefore feel it necessary to compromise a bit and promise you at half price a degree of the same name as you would obtain elsewhere after four years."

### Making the A.B. Degree a Junior College Degree

The special resolution passed at the Atlanta meeting deploring "any proposal, especially under war-time conditions, to award the Bachelor's degree at the close of junior college" strikes at one of the most serious proposals made during these times of emotional "thinking." As we have pointed out, the vice of the proposal is precisely the vice that in commercial advertising the nation tried to remedy in the Pure Food and Drugs Act of 1907 and in subsequent laws against misbranding articles for public consumption (and false advertising generally). The Atlanta resolution goes on to state: "During the first and second decades of this century, there were institutions in this region which granted Bachelor's degrees for only one or two years of



bona fide college work. The result was confusion as to the meaning of college on the part of students, their parents, and the general public." Now that there is a country-wide understanding that the college is a four-year institution with a four-year course of study leading to the Bachelor's degree, the attempt of one institution or of a few institutions to offer the same degree for two years of work will almost inevitably be understood by the public as an educational cut-rate or half-price sale. This appearance of bidding for students on a cut-rate basis can easily be avoided. Any college or university can set up a two-year degree. If it believes its two-year degree the equal of the four-year A.B. or B.S. degrees granted by other institutions, it can so proclaim, and it has the right to do its best to prove its claim. There was a two-year degree, the L.I., awarded by some two-year institutions a generation ago. The L.I., "Licentiate in Instruction," represented a frank attempt by the two-year normal schools to create a degree descriptive of the work they were trying to do. They did not claim to give *in two years* and a battery of examinations *the same degree* offered by other colleges *in four years*. The term "Associate in Arts" recently used quite freely to designate graduates of junior colleges also seems to be a satisfactory term. Any institution, however, with a bit of initiative can think up a new award\* and with proper planning and selection of students give its new degree a superior reputation. (It might even register it as a trade-mark and avoid all odious comparisons!)

If a university were to follow this clear-cut, straight-forward course of announcing frankly that it had organized a junior college and was offering a junior college degree based more heavily upon examination and more rigid selection of students than most diplomas now awarded by junior colleges it might have some rather striking initial degree of success.

In the first place, such a program would attract many superior students interested primarily in intellectual advancement. Some excellent students resent the extracurricular activities of the four-year college, including many who know they cannot excel in such activities. There are also some very shy students who shrink from the democracy of the four-year college. From a purely intellectual standpoint, these students might well be superior to the average student body of the good four-year college.

In the second place, the high degree of motivation obtained by creating the impression that the university, including these selected students, is engaged in pioneering reforms that will entirely change the American college might in itself mean superior quality of work. The scientific question with reference to a great many educational experiments is that the fact of experimentation provides extraneous motivation making it impossible to measure the value of the experiments. So long as an enthusiastic leader can induce an enthusiastic faculty and enthusiastic students to feel that they

---

\* One suggestion: translate *baccalaureus* as "Initiate," and offer a Ph.I. degree or Sc.I. as a distinctive two-year award.

are engaged in proving a work-shaking innovation, he can deceive himself as well as them into achieving superior results. Not until novelty wears off can the truth be gleaned.

In the third place, since many professional schools require only two years of college work for admission, the selected students who complete the two-year course would probably make a good showing in the highly specialized requirements of the professional schools. These schools would, certainly at first, welcome the opportunity to have their students enter younger and less burdened with debt for their undergraduate training. There is considerable experience to show that in any large group of students enrolled in graduate or professional schools, the youngest twenty per cent of the students produce a remarkable proportion of honor men. How fine it would be to have an entire school composed of these bright younger students!

In other words, it would be entirely possible for a university to achieve any legitimate purpose it has in reducing the undergraduate course to two years, without having to assume the stigma of sharp-practice suggested by awarding on a two-year basis the Bachelor's degree that has come to mean a four-year college course. Frankly, we see no reason for any institution that wishes to reduce the undergraduate course to two years to continue to offer its degree under the same name that has become the standard four-year degree of American colleges.

### Does the Four-Year College Still Have a Place in American Life?

The real issue involved in the proposal to offer after two years the A.B. degree when students have passed certain examinations is the life or death of the four-year American college. If universities and colleges with sufficient prestige decide to give the Bachelor's degree for two years of residence, the American four-year college is rather obviously doomed. In spite of the theory that the new two-year college *could* reach back and take the last two years of the senior high school, thereby reorganizing itself as a four-year institution, the practice would be for nearly all students in the small colleges to graduate from high school before coming to college, and after two years either "enter life" with their two-year A.B. degree, or go on to graduate and professional schools. The four-year college would be caught helpless between the senior high school and the larger universities. On the one hand the public high schools would continue to hold their students, and on the other hand the universities are obviously so much better equipped for graduate and professional work than the small college that the latter would have little opportunity to enter competition for students already holding the A.B. degree. There would probably also be an increasing tendency for communities to establish additional junior colleges, thereby weakening

still further the four-year colleges. The idea of the college we have discussed in an earlier note as "a place to grow up in" would be gone.

### Improving the Liberal Arts College\*

According to educational historians, the liberal arts college in western European tradition made its first appearance when the University of Athens grew from the union of the schools of rhetoric and philosophy. The free youth of Athens who sought self-improvement in the latter part of the Golden Age of Greece had the opportunity to attend a rhetorical school that taught all the arts of writing and speaking necessary for the free-born youth to defend his rights in a court of law or to influence his fellow citizens in the forum. These were no mean arts, since politics was the main road to promotion and since questions touching liberty and life were decided by enormous popular juries, before whom the defendant and plaintiff or prosecutor were required to appear in person and deliver their speeches as best they could. On the other hand, a youth relying upon native ability to enable him to speak adequately for purposes of persuasion or defense might decide against attending the rhetorical school and attend instead the philosophical schools best-known to us in the informal discussions of Socrates, the academy of Plato, and the lyceum of Aristotle. These schools dealt with the underlying problems of science in the widest sense—knowledge and understanding of nature and of man, of underlying causes and fundamental relationships. By the third century B. C. the University of Athens had appeared as a school of *arts and sciences* offering both the practical courses of the rhetorician (arts) and the theoretical courses of philosophy (science). From the beginning, therefore, the arts college has contemplated preparation for full living, including a reasonable amount of practical training. Its tradition has comprehended in its purposes insights into nature and into human relationships, and specific inquiry as to fundamental causes, as well as the acquiring of information and of facility in expressing and analyzing ideas. It has flourished whenever there has been sufficient prosperity for Europeans and their colonists to have opportunity to give their youth education in keeping with their ideas. It has never been quite submerged in times of poverty and distress—even during the long economic and spiritual depression that followed the downfall of the Roman Empire. It is the oldest institution for higher education in our culture. Thinkers, experts, and the common man have been discussing means of improving it for centuries. We are therefore in a goodly company when we consider the topic in our work conferences on higher education and our Association programs.

---

\* Not having opportunity to comment on the excellent report of the Work Conference on Higher Education published in the November *QUARTERLY*, the Editor contributes these comments dealing principally with the organization and administration of the curriculum of the arts college.—EDITOR.



The best approach to the problem of improving the arts college is probably the approach through its underlying philosophy. As I have suggested, its historical purpose has been to lead the student to enjoy the good life, with the introduction to the arts and sciences that will lead to such enjoyment. Since the ideal is Greek, it is admirably expressed in the old Greek adage "nothing too much," or the positive statement of the same idea, "everything in measure." When we think of a course of study for a prospective graduate of an arts college, we think, almost as a matter of course, of a person who is well-rounded in the important branches of human knowledge and activity. We are almost unconsciously impelled to Milton's definition, "I call therefore, a complete and generous education, that which fits a man to perform justly, skillfully and magnanimously all the offices, both public and private, of peace and war." Notice the terms "offices" used in the proper sense of "duties" and "magnanimously" implying a broad understanding and appreciation of the consequences of one's actions. We do not think of the graduate of an arts college as not having at least some knowledge of mathematics, some knowledge of foreign languages, some knowledge of science, some knowledge of history and the other social studies, some facility in the understanding and use of his mother tongue, and perhaps, some ideas of philosophy, or religion, or of vocation—acquired, if not directly in college, to the satisfaction of the college before the student receives his diploma. The original idea would include all of these things. For in the original idea education would be incomplete that omitted any of the major available fields of human knowledge and activity. In accordance with this philosophy we may well improve.

On the other hand, we definitely do not think of a college as a liberal arts college when it stresses vocational training as being the one important aim of education. The arts college properly considers vocational training as simply one part of the preparations for complete living and not the major part itself. The advocates of the liberal arts college very rarely are inclined to become angry at the frequently-heard criticism to the effect that the arts college simply tries to give to every American boy the kind of education that was planned for the English gentleman. If the education planned for the English gentleman—or for that matter for the Athenian free youth—really prepared him for the good life, and still has the ability to do so, the advocate of the arts college will promptly agree that he desires every American boy and girl to have quite a bit of this kind of education. There are many boys and girls sitting in colleges whose parents and grandparents were hewers of wood and drawers of water—certainly these youth are not part of any hereditary educational past. Many young instructors—zealous young men attending the educational altars—cry out that these newcomers "are not college material." Perhaps they are not. Perhaps they should definitely be encouraged to go to a good trade school in order that they may immediately

begin to earn their own living, but we should not decide too quickly. Just as Moses on one occasion, when his enthusiastic young follower protested against allowing certain plain people to prophesy, answered by the exclamation, "Would that all God's people were prophets!"—so do those who love the liberal arts college daily covet that its doors be kept open to every youth with ambition and mind to try to understand nature, man, God, and the highest products of human feeling and thinking. There undoubtedly comes a time in every individual's life, after he has passed the age limit for compulsory school attendance, when he will stop his general formal education and work intensively upon learning a vocation; but it is no function of the arts college to tell him that the trade-school skills are the *same thing* as an arts college diploma. The trade school may be a necessary substitute for one, two, or more years of what the arts college could give. In fact, we know that some students must receive all the liberal education they ever receive before graduating from high school. What they do receive makes the difference between them as civilized men and Hitler's or Mussolini's goose-steppers, however well-trained the latter may be in "practical" and technical matters.

If, then, we are to improve the arts college with reference to vocational education, we must find a line somewhere between recognizing vocation as a part of the idea of a good life, an important part, and on the other hand substituting vocational training for the general education that is the essence of the arts college.

When we consider the administration of the arts college, we need to watch closely our fundamental philosophy of a broad education for the good life. For instance, we need to watch our research specialists who have so multiplied knowledge and techniques in the various "departments" that they take an unsuspecting freshman or sophomore and steer him entirely away from a liberal education by narrowing his interests to their one department, with now and then grudging permission for him to do a little work in some very closely related field.

There are two problems of college administration that summarize what we need to know if we seek intelligently to improve the liberal arts college. These two problems may be stated curtly thus:

1. When is a student prepared for college? (What is a satisfactory basis of admission?)
2. When is he prepared to leave college with the approval of the institution? (That is, when may we say he really has what we are not ashamed to call a "college education"?)

It will be recalled that the medieval university had little worry as to when a student was prepared to enter. All lectures were in Latin, and obviously a student who did not understand Latin did not care to attend lectures.

Furthermore, if the student attended lectures, for example, at the University of Paris, in the early days, he did not formally enroll and he paid no fees. He attended such lectures as he found interesting and now and then gave his instructor, who had his living from the church, a personal honorarium. (The child's gift of a big red apple to his favorite teacher has quite honorable lineage!) The student received no grades, could stay as long as he wished, and might finally ask for the privilege of standing an examination and later of defending his thesis. In fact, his examination for what we think of as the Bachelor's degree was recognized as merely his "commencement" or "beginning" of graduate study leading to the Master's or Doctor's degree. The very term *baccalaureus* indicated a beginner, and we still speak of "commencement" as the day the college student achieves his diploma, even though relatively few Bachelors go on to graduate degrees.

When Harvard University first announced its admission requirements, it stated a list of Latin and Greek works that the student should be able to read before admission to college. This practice of admission by examination, or of requiring the student to demonstrate what he could do in certain fields, was the accepted method until the University of Michigan in 1871 initiated the system of accepting students on certificates from approved secondary schools. We now have general acceptance of students by certificate from high schools of very varying excellence with very varied curricula. We also have admission by examination; for example, by the college entrance board. Few people claim that the results are satisfactory. Two students of equal earnestness may be accepted from the same high school, and one of them fail to pass his first semester's work, while the other goes on to Phi Beta Kappa. A student comes in from a weak high school and, in spite of a poor start, is found to be leading his class in scholarship. The colleges give various orientation tests and try to section their students in order to reduce failures. They provide earnest young deans to advise and guide, but still they see students fail from college, who simply were not prepared when they entered. I have no panacea to suggest for this problem. I am inclined to think, however, that the day is passing when the high school diploma is sufficient evidence of preparation for college. Many changes in attitude will have to be made, but I believe the colleges will gain the right to set their own entrance examinations and require every student to demonstrate whether he is prepared for that particular college before he is accepted for it. There have been encouraging experiments in state-wide testing by associations of colleges that have set standards used by member colleges or by the association administering them to deter students from entering who fall definitely below standards proved to be necessary for doing the work of the colleges considered. Beside the point of our discussion is the social desirability of providing other schools for students who cannot qualify for the arts college. Personally,



I think such schools should be provided—quite possibly by the federal government as part of a permanent policy of national defense.

College administrators are working just as hard, and they probably think just as futilely, upon the problem of what they should require a student to have, or be, or do, before he receives his diploma. Do they want him to have just so many courses completed with no grade less than 70, or D? Do they want him to have so many courses with an average of 80, or C? Do they want him to have certain information, skills, and insights that will enable him to stand a comprehensive examination, or do they want him, as the medieval school demanded of its graduates, to present a masterpiece or thesis? Many of us can remember when every student had to present a senior thesis as part of his requirements for graduation. Here, again, I can present no panacea. The restlessness of colleges with reference to the administration of the curriculum is evidence that they are working for improvement.

In the field of curriculum, the arts college is struggling more continuously toward improvement than probably in any other field. It may be well to summarize the ideals of curriculum as they have appeared historically and left their residue for our current thinking.

First, the medieval university had the ideal of universal knowledge, divided into the "seven liberal arts." The great textbooks from the fourth century A. D. to the eleventh century were really encyclopedias, and with the meagre knowledge of the times the ideal that the educated man should know everything was not so unreasonable.

Then came the scholastic idea, surprisingly like the practice of Socrates in attempting to elevate logic and reason as the primary basis of knowledge.

The humanistic ideal of the Renaissance came as an attempt to regain from the classics an understanding of man, his arts, and his philosophies. It is well to remember that the Revival of Learning did not at all stress Latin and Greek for themselves or as exercises in grammar. The original emphasis of the Renaissance was to recover the arts of living known to the ancients.

We may say, then, that at the beginning of modern times the arts college had clearly in its curriculum materials that could be classed as knowledge, materials and methods primarily intended to stimulate thinking, and materials that were regarded as tool subjects with which to achieve further results by way of understandings and insights. Early in the modern period, there began to be a realization that universal knowledge was impossible. The religious Reformation also stressed the desirability of using education to shape character. The scholastic ideal of emphasizing training in thinking and disputation formed a queer amalgam with these to produce the disciplinary theory of education. Since the student could not learn everything, the purpose of a curriculum came to be thought of as training the student in good habits either as a student or as a moral man. We still have a strong

element of disciplinary training in our character-education programs and our civic-education programs. If I call the ideal anything else than *disciplinary* training, there will probably be few of my readers who would deny that the primary purposes of the arts college lie in what it does to the student instead of what it pours into him by way of information and the like. We may thus list as fourth in our ideals of college education developed the ideal of discipline or training. This ideal kept out of the colleges for a long time such courses as English literature and American history: if the student could learn how to study history and literature by reading Latin and Greek, he could learn all the English literature and American history he needed as outside activities. Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, for instance, is supposed to have suffered in his grades at Harvard because he spent so much time reading English literature as an extra-curricular activity. Daniel Webster and John C. Calhoun learned to speak quite acceptably by studying the masterpieces of Greek and Latin oratory. In other words, the theory wasn't nearly so bad in practice as we should like to assume, except that it probably reduced the number of students who might otherwise have profitably attended college.

The disciplinary theory of education was not seriously challenged until Herbert Spencer and his contemporaries made their celebrated drive to find a place for science in the educational sun. Scientific studies were introduced after great argument as to whether there is transfer of training and whether there can be true disciplinary education. By an odd turn of events today it is the scientist who almost alone insists that his method, the laboratory technique, is a necessary discipline for the student; for example, very few science teachers in college are willing for a student—no matter how many elementary laboratory courses he may have had in other fields—to take elementary work with them without having their own particular laboratory discipline. It will be seen that this fifth curriculum element, the emphasis upon science, is a revival of the first ideal, if not universal knowledge at least broad knowledge of nature, plus the disciplinary ideal of the much idolized method or technique.

I might suggest as a sixth important source the materials of education looming so large more recently in the curriculum, the social studies, and perhaps as a seventh the more recent emphasis upon the fine arts, including literature. In speaking of the recent emphasis upon the social studies, I prefer the term "social studies" to the term "social sciences"—because it is not clear when the term "social sciences" is used in the archaic sense of science as "knowledge" and when it is used as a sort of aping of the natural sciences, with undesirable implications of exact measurement not applicable to things social; and I think the term preferable also because the "social studies" clearly include history which the historians rightly, I think, insist is not a science. This emphasis upon the social studies is really a sort of

revival of the spirit of the early Renaissance, a return to the theory that "the proper study of mankind is man." Perhaps because students have shown so much enthusiasm the last quarter of a century for history, government, economics, sociology, and education, to the exclusion of that other interest of humanism, the study of man's art and literature, we have had the trend toward a broader and more vigorous emphasis upon the fine arts, including an opportunity for considerable expression in the arts.

I have not tried to make this list exhaustive. I have, for instance, omitted the vigorous effort of teachers of English to improve the work in English composition with the sympathetic coöperation of college administrations and even of the faculty in other fields. What I have said, however, indicates clearly that the curriculum of the arts college is embarrassed with riches. It is not too much to say that with unbridled free electives there are many colleges in which four or more students, provided they had the ability, could matriculate side by side and graduate from a creditable four-year course without any two of them taking very much of the same work. In the old days, the four-year course was pretty definitely prescribed; then there was a period when it was prescribed as to kind of work rather than departments; for example, the student instead of taking Latin and Greek might take Latin and French or German and later French and German instead of either. He also might have choice among various laboratory sciences. Then came the elective system; then the addition of majors and minors to assure some sort of concentration, together with a few general electives; then the system of groups of studies recommended for students interested in certain vocational activities—but always including an important "general" group—in which the student elected his group rather than specific departments or courses; and finally the system of "divisions of concentration," usually listed as the division of natural sciences, the division of social studies, and the division of humanities, theoretically to break down over-departmentalization—with the idea of liberalizing and broadening the student's course and at the same time integrating it.

I should add somewhere (having already passed "*finally*" in my enumeration!) the so-called college "honor courses" that have been so much advertised. Because the average college seems to know as little about where to place the "honors courses" as I do, I might digress here—logically enough, because the "honors courses" as to-date administered in most of our colleges are a digression from the logical development of their curriculum—to point out some of the difficulties of the honors courses. In the first place, the term "honors courses" is like the term "Progressive Education" when the latter is used to apply to an incorporated group which has chosen to take the name—not all members of the group are necessarily progressive in the common sense of the term, and a good many people not in the group may be exceedingly progressive by any ordinary definition. Similarly, honors



courses in a good many institutions simply mean tutorial courses given according to the method of the English universities. They are intrinsically not more "honorable" than lecture courses, or laboratory courses, or discussion courses; the term "honors" as applied to them is an English importation and sometimes a conscious bribe by the college to coax the abler students to take them. The bribe sometimes boomerangs: a boy who considers Phi Beta Kappa an honor *after* he or a fellow student has *earned* it, is self-conscious about declaring himself an honors student in the middle of his college course, and his fellow students tend to set him aside as they do a certain type of ministerial student. In fact the "honors" courses do not attract the best students of the average college for two or three rather easily discerned reasons: in the first place, they almost always stress an unduly heavy major in some department, whereas the average good student has a broad range of interests and wishes to use his four years of undergraduate college to learn something about a great many fields (even a student who wishes to go on to his Doctor of Philosophy degree is probably better advised to take a minimum major in his field as an undergraduate and get as much elementary related work as he can, rather than to have to go back as a graduate student of history for instance and take elementary courses in government, economics, and sociology); in the second place, although they frequently advertise a large amount of free reading which theoretically would take care of your Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, in reality they contain a large amount of rigidly prescribed classics dealing with some period, for instance, in English literature, and some of the ablest students resent free reading when interpreted to mean heavy required reading. In the third place, the honors courses in the English universities constitute an alternative to a "pass" degree. American colleges do not offer the "pass" degree, and furthermore the general degree of the colleges seems to come so much nearer meeting the needs and desires of the students than the ordinary honors course that it is doubtful whether many of the ablest students in the average college—with all the pressure the faculty can bring to bear—will leave the ordinary curriculum for any honors curriculum patterned on the English model. There is the final difficulty with the honors courses as developed up to the present time in American colleges that American college teachers have almost without exception developed their interests and techniques along the lines of superior lecturing, superior organization of materials, superior discussion leadership, and superior laboratory technique rather than along the line of tutorial instruction: it is not merely that they are not trained for tutorial instruction, but the additional fact that they really do not seem interested in it.\*

\* The excellent record and enthusiasm of the returned Rhodes scholars are at best equivocal recommendations of the superiority of the English honors courses over our American methods of lectures, reading, and class discussions. In the first place all these brilliant Rhodes scholars were shaped in the American methods in secondary school and college before they

Having digressed to point out that honors courses probably do not offer much hope for general improvement of the arts colleges, I revert to the summary we have just made of the materials now in the curriculum of the liberal arts college. These materials include methods of approach and points of emphasis as well as actual subject-matter. Instead, therefore, of merely having seven classes of materials, we can multiply by two or three to make allowance for similar subject-matter that may be treated in two or three different ways with two or three different primary purposes in mind. The problem is further complicated by the fact that as the curriculum of the liberal arts college has steadily expanded, so the curricula of the elementary and secondary schools have expanded. These schools, particularly the secondary schools, have followed the example of the colleges and have worked their curricula out in much the same way. They have followed the elective system, they have had constants required of all students, they have had groups of studies leading to diplomas. In short, they have had all the problems and have attempted all the solutions the colleges have had and attempted.

I have already referred to the difficult problem of administration the colleges have faced in the matter of admission of students. The problem of course is a matter of curriculum as well as a matter of administration. Colleges are not only embarrassed by riches in the matter of what they offer their students, they are equally embarrassed by the varied opportunities the students who present themselves have had. This fact leads me to the first point at which I think we can very much improve the curriculum of the liberal arts college. We should recognize that the college curriculum is built directly upon the curriculum of the elementary and secondary schools. We know that these schools have ordinarily required certain subjects, English for instance, years before the student comes to college. The first grade child begins reading the best of folk literature and begins oral and even written composition. For eleven or twelve years he is given a chance to sample the best English and American literature and to learn to write. If in these twelve years he has acquired sufficient facility in writing the mother tongue to be able to write as good a theme during freshman orientation week as the average freshman who passes freshman English can write at the end of his freshman year, why compel him to take another year of English composition? Why not make it optional with him to take an elective course in composition or any other suitable freshman course instead of the ordinary drill course intended for students who cannot write? Furthermore, if with all his study of English and American literature for twelve years of elementary

---

went to Oxford. In the second place they were very highly selected men: if we were to select with equal care a similar body of young American scholars and send them to Harvard or any other great American university—free from the frequent worries of “working their way through college”—we should probably not need to fear comparison ten, fifteen, or twenty years later with any group of men trained under the English system.

and secondary education he has not gained sufficient interest to care to continue reading English classics, why compel him—certainly if he is a good student—to take the ordinary course in sophomore literature? Why not let him elect courses in English or history or government or science that stimulate his interest? Not all the classics have been written as either poetry or novels. I have never seen why *Tom Jones* or *Clarissa Harlowe* is any better reading for the average college boy than the masterpieces of historical writing or of economics or of science if he is more interested in history or economics or science than in so-called “literature.” Similarly, why require a student who has had at least two, and perhaps four, elementary laboratory sciences in a good secondary school to take two additional sciences when he enters college? Why not excuse him from at least one of the ordinarily required college sciences; and if he has had a heavy schedule of sciences in high school, why compel him to take any science in college at all? The same thing is true of foreign languages and of mathematics and of the social studies. Why not materially reduce the amount of work in any field the student has cultivated intensively in high school as far as the requirements exacted from him in college are concerned? As a matter of fact, why require any student who has completed two years of algebra and a year of plane geometry in a good high school—check him if you wish by some sort of examination—to take any mathematics in college except such as may be required by his specific course, a pre-medical course for instance, or the course in business administration? I know the cry usually raised by college people when we try to point out that they ignore almost completely the type of course the student has had in high school is that so many college students receive such poor preparation in high school. My retort to this suggestion is in part this: it is a terrific reflection on the college and its entrance committee if it does not get at least one student who is prepared for college for every one who is not prepared. Now assuming that the college gets at least half of its students from those who are prepared, please let us plan our college curriculum for the half that are prepared instead of planning it for the half who are unprepared. Of course, it might be well to plan for each group; but if we are going to ignore either group, why should it be the group which *bona fide* meets our requirements?

What I have said about recognizing the previous work the student has had before he entered college means that I believe we can very materially improve the liberal arts college by reducing our minimum required work that so frequently duplicates work a major portion of the student-body has had in high school and so frequently consumes the first two or more years of the student's college course. If we require two years of English, two years in each of two foreign languages, one year each in two elementary sciences, one year of mathematics, one year of history, we have a full half of the requirements for a Bachelor's degree. Then many institutions require a course in religion or philosophy on top of what I have outlined, besides perhaps

requiring still more of foreign language from certain students. There are two objections to consuming two or more years of the student's art course in elementary required work, aside from the fact that so much of this elementary required work duplicates work the student has already had. (Incidentally, it is possible that the partial success of the so-called generalized orientation courses that have been tried out by many of our good institutions lies in the fact that the students who like them have already had much of the same material in secondary school. A student who really had a poor foundation for history, government, economics, and sociology may find these courses even more distasteful than the old-time introductory freshman courses in history. We may find on further investigation that the real place for generalized courses is in the senior year rather than the freshman.)

The two difficulties I have suggested as to compelling the student to spend all of his first two years or more in required elementary courses are these: in the first place, since more than half of the students in any college are likely to be freshmen and sophomores, this plan means that more than half of the entire faculty is engaged in teaching routine required courses so standardized that they can use the same syllabus year after year, a deadly situation for both student and faculty; and in the second place, this plan means that all these courses, except freshman-sophomore English, have a tendency to enroll both freshmen and sophomores in perhaps a general proportion of two to three in favor of one class or the other. This co-enrollment of freshmen and sophomores means that the level of these classes is really pitched somewhere between freshman and sophomore difficulty, so that the average freshman has to hustle to keep up, while the average sophomore actually finds his work in many courses easier than in his freshman year. Of course this may in part be offset by the fact that the student may postpone to his sophomore year the courses he most dreads. On the other hand, if the absolutely required uniform work can be reduced by making sophomore English an elective, by eliminating one of the required sciences for students with a good science training in high school, by requiring the third year of one foreign language—which would give the student an opportunity to study some literature in that language—instead of compelling him to take two years of two different languages, by eliminating college mathematics for all who have met a certain minimum standard unless they wish to elect it or go on with science, or by giving a choice between history and perhaps an elementary course in some other social study not necessarily on the freshman level, the faculty would be released to teach interesting elective courses on the sophomore-junior level, and the students would find themselves in genuine freshman courses the first year and genuine sophomore courses the next. The faculty, released from the drudgery of routine required courses, would enrich their teaching as they dealt more and more with courses in which they were actually interested and with students who really chose their courses.



On the other hand, we might do well to watch them lest they try to encroach upon the time we have allowed the student when we reduce the number of required elementary courses. The tendency of over-enthusiastic faculty folk to enlarge the claims of their departmental major the moment the student is released from a routine course is automatic. A major of twenty-four semester hours\* in one department with the possible maximum election of six additional hours is in my opinion as much specialization as the arts college should tolerate, and twelve semester hours of work in one minor department with possible election of not more than twelve more should be the limit in any required minor. I should try to give every student at least a year and a half, or perhaps forty-five semester hours, of free electives including the very slight elective work in the major department. But to do this the colleges must offer more and better electives—definitely planned for different advancement of students. For example, whether because of greater maturity, or broader general culture, or some transfer of training, a junior or senior class in American history or elementary science, or beginning a foreign language, can do not only more work but a better quality of work than the freshman classes for whom these courses are usually offered. We sorely need, for instance, non-laboratory lecture and reading courses in elementary science for juniors and seniors. Why do we refuse to permit at least these advanced students to learn something of Mendel's laws and Darwin's and Pasteur's theories without making them smell all the formaldehyde and alcohol of the laboratory and dissect a frog? Why should a student who decides his junior or last year in college that he would like to learn a bit of German not be given the chance without having to go into a freshman section? Why should we not have more courses in comparative literature in translation, or in ethics and philosophy of living, for students on different levels of maturity? Why should sociologists sometimes fight so sharply to introduce their subject matter into the high school, and then refuse to offer a freshman elective in sociology and only rarely admit sophomores to their elementary course? If the arts college—with a thick skinned and keen committee to pass on duplications among all new courses proposed—were to encourage its students to elect as many courses as they could that would open their eyes and minds and hearts, I believe it could give a liberal education to its students such as no other generation of students has had.

Another suggestion as to improving the curriculum is this: it should be

---

\* As Dr. Edwin Hunter, of Maryville College, points out, one witty dean suggests that twenty-four semester hours in the major should suffice for any good student, but a poor student might require thirty! The moment a department demands a major in excess of twenty-four hours there is evidence that the department is thinking in terms of the student who is preparing for graduate school in that field; for such a student the work ceases to be liberal and becomes vocational. Six additional hours elective for these vocational students should be enough to subtract from their general education. This is more than we allow in "professional" training for the much larger group of students preparing to teach in secondary schools—more than we allow for any group except for the highly technical and much criticised pre-medical group.

so organized in some part at least—whether certain courses, or the student's major work, or his senior year, or all of his work—that the student could realize that *quality* of work is necessary for a liberal education. He ought to be made to see and feel that “70” or “D” or even a “C” average is not a liberal ideal.

And finally the arts college should combat the sleek and lazy fallacy formulated even by some instructors that “mere facts” are unimportant, that the main and only important thing is to know where and how to find facts. The man with a truly liberal education respects facts, and he learns to use them—just as the technical expert must use them. If I go hunting with you and your gun accidentally fires and severs the main artery in your right leg, it does you no good for me to tell you that over in the medical school library at Duke University on the second shelf in the corner nearest the south door is a big book with blue cover by such and such a celebrated specialist which in Chapter V tells how to bind up a severed artery. Bleeding to death, and that right promptly, you might realize that accurate information and an understanding how to use it—and not merely where to find it—helps the man with a liberal education “to perform justly, skillfully, and magnanimously all the “duties of public and private life.”

I am well aware that I have not discussed in any detail the “divisions of concentration” so prominent in some recently revised college curricula. These divisions of concentration—usually indicated as the natural sciences, the social studies, and the humanities, with sometimes a sub-division of the natural sciences into physical and biological sciences as separate “divisions”—have in greater or less degree been intended to serve such purposes as these: to be useful as a rough division of subject matter—“the natural sciences” of course representing a study of nature, “the social studies” a study of man, and “the humanities” a study of what man has thought and felt in his reactions to environments natural and social; to serve as a basis for elementary synthesizing courses that have attempted on freshman and sophomore level to introduce the college student in thorough arts fashion to the sum total of human knowledge; to serve “to integrate the student’s course” by “breaking down the artificial barriers between subject matter departments”; and to serve to compel the student to take a reasonable minimum of work away from his special interests by requiring him to have some material in all three or four of the so-called “divisions.” The difficulties in so working the divisions as to realize their desirable possibilities have, however, been as numerous as their intended advantages. In the first place, the elementary synthesizing courses have not been accepted without question, and it is quite possible that the partial success of these courses lies in the fact that the colleges are building on material the student has already had in high school—without frankly realizing the fact. If they frankly realized what the student had had in high school instead of merely re-arranging it



through a synthesizing "survey course," they might get still better results. A "scrap-basket course" of a little anthropology, a little history, a little government, a little economics, a little sociology, and a little current events may be worth nothing to a student who has not had well-organized courses in history and kindred subjects before he is presented with the scrap basket. It is hard to synthesize material of which you do not already have a fair elementary grasp.

In the second place, the evils of "artificial" barriers between "departments" are not always remedied by placing departments on opposite sides of new artificial "divisions." Psychology, for example, in its physiological aspects belongs to the natural sciences; in other aspects it is fundamental to the social studies; and if the basis of classifying the humanities is an attempt to gather together the product of man's thought and feeling, it is hard to leave psychology out of the humanities. Similarly, with philosophy and with education. In short, it is hard to separate man as man from nature and is harder still to imagine him as thinking and feeling and expressing himself apart from both nature and his fellows. The truth of the matter seems to be that except for reminding students and faculty of the three aspects from which universal knowledge may be considered, and potentially suggesting that the student should really learn something as to all three, the attempt to base the college curriculum upon the so-called divisions is highly artificial. It arises probably from a nostalgic yearning for the good old days when a student in the small arts college could study more than one science under the same instructor and learn his physics, geology, and chemistry as more or less integrated subject matter instead of learning them more or less insulated from one another as he now does in any first class university. There was also a time when the student could learn his theories of government and even of economics and sociology as a part of his study of general and American history. He could even obtain a Doctor's degree from superior universities with a double major in history and political science and a strong minor in economics, instead of devoting practically his whole three-year course to the study of American history with perhaps the last year and a half devoted exclusively to a study of Reconstruction in a small segment of the State of Georgia for some particular ten-year period. This yearning of arts college faculties and more particularly arts college administrations for a better generalization of the student's knowledge is an evidence of the traditional emphasis of the arts college upon what it considers a liberal education. It is also a reminder of how definitely professional—vocational, if you please—the Doctor's degree has become in some of our great universities. It is probably true that many graduate schools are training Doctors of Philosophy whose training has been too specialized for them to make the best college teachers. On the other hand, it is hard to see how grouping highly

technical departments into artificial divisions of concentration will help the arts college realize its ideals.

In brief, when we study the improvement of the arts college in the light of Milton's ideal of a complete and generous education, we suggest these ideas among the many that throng for consideration:

1. Admission procedures should be refined to admit only those students whose previous education can be accepted as adequate foundation for what the college offers;

2. We should be wary of any scheme that detracts from the well-rounded understanding of life and the universe that is the essence of the arts college—as wary of the over-specialized “honors” course as of the over-specialized “vocational” course;

3. We should recognize the essentially vocational nature of the top-heavy departmental major;

4. We should recognize the fact that it is the same student we educate, whether we teach him in secondary school or in college, and should plan his course to guide him into continuous growth without making him repeat in college what he has already learned well in high school;

5. We should so organize the college as to permit the continuous growth of the student, by reducing the mass of elementary required courses that sometimes clog the first two years, and by offering well-planned electives from the freshman year through the senior;

6. We should encourage at least a minimum of high *quality* work and at least a minimum of work in which students gain a clear appreciation of accurate knowledge of “mere facts”;

7. We should guard against accepting slogans instead of results: “breaking down the artificial barriers between subject-matter departments” was a fine slogan with which to introduce the equally artificial “divisions of concentration.”

### The A.B. Degree on the Basis of Two Years Work: An Open Forum for All Interested Members

The proposed giving of the A.B. degree by some institutions on the basis of only two years of college work plus a comprehensive examination is so far reaching in its implication for education that the *QUARTERLY* is announcing an open forum for its August number and inviting discussion from any interested person connected with the Southern Association.

Contributions should be limited to perhaps a thousand words; but unless so many members respond as to compel the editor to conserve space, longer contributions will be considered. Short contributions, even to the extent of very brief answers to the questions suggested below, will also be welcome. The questions suggested are not intended to limit the discussion but to stimulate the thinking of those interested. The following are the questions suggested:



1. What will be the probable effects of the proposed change if only one or two universities adopt it?
2. What will be the effect if a number of reasonably strong institutions adopt it?
3. Has the four-year college outlived its place in American education?
4. Should the typical American four-year college, with its extracurricular activities and provisions for residence on the campus, be abandoned in favor of a system of predominantly local junior colleges, supplemented by a system of advanced professional and graduate schools with little or no campus life; that is, with as nearly as possible a complete emphasis upon professional and intellectual attainment?
5. Should there be a degree granted wholly on the basis of examination by universities to persons who pass stated examinations? (It will be recalled that it has not been long since most of the English universities other than Oxford and Cambridge followed this practice.)
6. Should there be a degree awarded primarily upon the basis of examinations?
7. Are two years of college work sufficient for the general student who does not expect to enter a profession?
8. Is it desirable for students to enter graduate and professional schools younger than they now do?
9. Should we reduce the period of elementary-secondary education to ten years, then add a four-year college, and then place professional and graduate schools on top of that, instead of having a twelve-year elementary-secondary school, etc.?
10. Could the secondary schools meet some of the criticisms as to the waste involved in the present four-year college by making provision to accelerate the work of capable students? In other words, may not the proposal of a two-year A.B. degree come in part from the casual observing of bright students, intellectually mature, who have been held back in classes with pupils of the same chronological age?
11. Is it desirable to keep the advanced work of college wholly for students of primarily intellectual interests?
12. Has the South made a mistake—in view of the present suggestions as to counting the last two years of high school as the first two of college—in accelerating the development from an eleven-year system of elementary and secondary education to a twelve-year system?

The QUARTERLY asks these questions merely to start the discussion. The main idea is for each reader to sit down while he thinks of the matter and express his views in his own way.

---

**The Forty-seventh Annual Meeting of the Southern Association will take place November 30-December 4 in Memphis, Tennessee. The Peabody will be headquarters hotel.**